JOURNAL

OF

Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute

TIRUPATI

VOL. VII — NO. I

JANUARY—JUNE, 1946

EDITOR :

P. V. RAMANUJASVAMI, M.A.

CONTENTS

Page

1. The Philosophy of Religion of the Āḷvārs: ... 1
   Dr. K. C. Varadachari, M.A. Ph.D.

2. Humour in Sanskrit Plays: ... 12
   Sri P. V. Ramanujaswami, M.A.

3. Tamilian Cosmetics: ... 22
   Sri T. P. Palaniappa Pillai, B.O.L.

4. Śrī Rāma, the King and Śambūka, the Śūdra-saint: ... 39
   Sri N. Subrahmanya Sastri, M.A.

5. The Interpretation of the double dates Āṇḍu and Edir-Āṇḍu in Regnal Years of certain Chōḷa, Pāṇḍya and other Kings: ... 43
   Sri S. Subrahmanya Sastri, B.A.

6. Reviews: ... 69

7. Annals: ... 79

SANSKRIT

1. सन्देशद्वयसारास्वादिनी 1
   Sri A. V. Gopalachariar, M.A., B.L.

TELUGU

1. వినోదవిమర్శము
   Sri V. Prabhakara Sastri. ... 1

2. వైఖానససూత్రము, శాస్త్రము - వీని రచనాకాలము
   Sri R. Parthasarathi Aiyangar ... 13

JOURNAL

OF

Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute

VOL. VII JANUARY—JUNE 1946 PART I

THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION OF THE ĀḶVĀRS[1]

BY

Dr. K. C. VARADACHARI, M.A., Ph.D.

TIRUPPĀN ĀḶVĀR

INTRODUCTORY

Tiruppānāḷvār is the untouchable saint of Śrī Vaiṣṇavism. He has sung ten verses only. These ten verses are to be seen as the revelation of the form of God to the unveiled eyes, and it is the most beautiful form of the Divine, the gentle form of the Divine. The story runs that Tiruppānāḷvār used to pray to the Lord of Śrīraṅgam every day from a distance on the banks of the Cauvery.[2] One Lokasāraṅgamahāmuni who used to perform the service of taking holy water from the Cauvery to the Lord for bath everyday, seeing the saint standing near where he used to take the water for the Lord, asked him to move away from that place throwing a stone at him since he was completely in a trance of Love. It struck the saint on his forehead and blood began to flow. Aroused from his trance by this, the saint saw the muni, and feeling that he had committed a mistake in standing at the place moved away from the place. The muni having performed his ablutions and bath, filled his vessel with water for bath of the Lord and went away. But that night the Lord appeared to the muni and instructed him to bring on his own shoulders the saint for having treated the saint that morning in the

1. cf. *JSVOI.* Vols. III, IV, V and VI on earlier Āḷvārs.
2. A South Indian river of great repute.

manner he had done. Thus ordered next morning the muni went to the saint and told him that the Lord of Śrīraṅgam had ordered him to bring the saint to Him but the āḻvār told him that he could not tread even the ground of the Lord of Śrīraṅgam. The muni then offered to carry him on his own shoulders in conformity with the commands of the Lord. On entering the sacred precincts of the temple the Lord manifested to him His most auspicious form of grace. The āḻvār first saw the sacred feet of God, then the apparel, then the navel, the neck and shoulders, and the face and the crown—all of increasing entrancing beauty. The last line breaths the transcendent note "My eyes having beheld thee cannot verily have any place for seeing anything else."

The first three āḻvārs like the Vedic seers enjoyed the transcendent primarily and touched upon the theme of arcā. Like Vālmīki, Kulaśekhara being devoted to the Lord as Rāma enjoyed also the arcā-form of God, because the arcā is the most approachable form. Śaṭhakopa like Parāśara and Veda Vyāsa, attracted to God as Śrī Kṛṣṇa, experienced the beauties and glories of the arcā also. Tirumaṅgai āḻvār whilst enjoying the transcendent Lord lost himself in the effulgence of the arcā. This āḻvār, on the other hand, was fully devoted to the arcā-form. This is the view of Aḻakiya-manavālapperumāl. We can see however that the āḻvār starts with the most complete statement of the secret unity of the five-fold Lord. Indeed as Śrī Venkaṭanātha has stated in his commentary on Tiruppāṇ-āḻvār's work *Amalan-āti-pirān* (the name of the work obviously taken from the opening words of the hymn) it includes in it the esoterics of the Praṇava.[1] the sacred root-formula, the Dvaya and the carama-śloka of the Gītā. Thus any one who studies this work should also seize upon the esoteric suggestion underlying this great but small work. It is because of its supreme quality the āḻvār is described as '*Kaviśvara*' (Lord of Poets).[2]

THE POEM

I. The lotus-feet of the Lord-God of the long-walled, Śrīraṅgam, the taintless, the origin, the helper, the luminous being who made me the servant of the devotees of His feet, the King of immortals, the dweller on

1. The first letter of the first Hymn is *A*, the first letter of the second verse is *U*, the first letter of the third verse is *M*. cf. the Tiruvāymoḻi which begins with the first verse itself having the U, M, A as the initial letters of the first three lines.

2. Śrī-lokasāraṅga-mahāmunīndraskandhādhirūdham kalayāmi nityam |
Kaḻaṅkahīnam kamanīyabhaktam *kaviśvaram* gāyaka-sārvabhaumam.

the fragrant forest Veṅgadam, immaculate, holy, the Ruler of the law-abiding-abode, who has absorbed my mind, have entered my eye of themselves and revealed themselves (as vision).

The Divine is above all as the supreme object of the religious consciousness, transcendent to all the faults and mistakes and errors and illusion of man, or the soul, however high up in evolution. That is the reason why the Divine is addressed as the *Amalan*, the enemy of all defects. Not only is He in Himself so free, it is a dynamic nature in so far as any one who approaches Him or touches Him in any maner is freed from all sins and defects. In Him all the faults get extinguished because ever extinguished (*apahatapāpmatva* is the essential and primary sign of deity). He is the Origin of the Created universe. He is the only creator, there was no second at the beginning. It is stated in Vedānta (V. S. I. i. 2 : *Janmādyasya yataḥ*) that it is the primary fact about God as the sign of sovereign transcendence of His nature. He is also the Helper, the saviour (*pirān*) of all souls, because He is the saviour, and all the rest whether gods or men or creatures of any other kind and variety are the saved, the *śeṣavarga*, other than the One supreme Divine. Thus the āḻvār no sooner than he utters the first trumpeting epithets of the divine nature proceeds to speak of himself as having been made the attender or servant of the servants and worshippers of His feet, the very feet that now have of their own accord, entered his mortal but rather transformed eyes. This is a great step in the path of ascent to glory. The love of the feet of the knowers of truth, the truth that is important and pregnant with supremest possibilities. The Divine on accepting the surrender of the soul places him under the service of the masters of devotion, because He has the right to dispose of the soul as He supremely pleases. It is pointed out that the Lord is eternally a free Being who is distinct from the bound souls made free. He is also superior to the immortals because He is their sovereign. The Lord of Veṅgadam thus is stated to be the same Being whom the Gods worship, according to tradition and legend.

He is the person who removes the defects of others also, of those who seek absolute refuge in Him only. Indeed is He *āśrita-paratantra.* He is easy of access and is Good. By such acts of removing other's defects or sins He does not get tainted by them. Thus he is *nimalan* and *nirmalan.* Though omniscient without any reservation of place and time, yet because of His absolute love for His devotees He does not 'see' the faults of these, and even if He sees them He

sees them for the purpose of removing them. He is the source of all *Nīti* or *dharma*. Indeed His is the world of *Nīti*, of absolute righteousness, of divine order or Ṛta, because even the denizens of that universe (*paramapada*) are absolutely spontaneously righteous and dutiful to the Divine Being only. He is the cool and wonderful Being of the island of Śrīraṅgam and the Master who grants the status of the serpent of Himself in the celestial abode. The verse fully lays down the characteristics of God and of the souls in relation to Him. The supreme secret of the path is the surrender to the Will of the Divine alone, because the Divine is Pure, effulgent, Holy, origin of All, the beneficent Lord, who of Himself hastens to the devotees to grant them His Vision. And the vision starts with the most auspicious sign of the Feet of God.[1]

> II. Growing big (like a lotus) measured the worlds to the upmost extent of space where it was anointed by Brahman and other (Godheads): Rāma destroyer of the night-wanderers with fierce arrows! Lord of Śrīraṅgam of fragrant gardens!—in thine red-cloth hath my mind got entranced.

The first verse stated the spontaneous free-coming in of the Grace of God. In the second verse is mentioned the joy of seeing the garment of God in addition to the seeing of the feet. Descent of Grace and of God into the individual is intimated.

The great Veṅkaṭanātha states that this verse has reference to the Trivikrama-avatār of Śrī Viṣṇu who having made up His mind to help Indra who had lost his sovereignty to Bali, and having also decided to protect Bali, the grand-son of Prahlāda, his asura-devotee, placed His splendid feet (which really typifies His omnipervasiveness) on all gods and asuras and men without distinction, in order to reveal His own supreme sovereign Grace and protective consideration for all creatures. The āḻvār realised here the supreme graciousness and love typified by the red-cloth, red being the colour of deep love for creatures. It is the Dawn of Grace.[2] Thus the feet of the Lord were followed by the vision of the lovely and love-revealing

1. Cf. J. S. V. O. I., Vol. IV. Sri D. T. Tatacharya discusses the poetic values of the Amālan-āti-pirān and points out that Tiruppāṇāḻvār conforms to the principle enunciated by ancient sages of describing God feet upwards which is the reverse of describing human beings however great.

2. Āḻvārs always represent the redness of Kṛṣṇa's eyes as representing his love for his creatures and devotees in particular.

attribute of the godhead, the sovereign, Lord of all the worlds, the Sire of Brahman and Ruler of gods.

This is succeeded by the Divine Lord revealing His navel, the navel from which Brahman took his birth.

> III. The Dawn-like[1] cloth round the waist of Him who is on the Veṅgadam hill of the Northern boundary (of the Tamil land) where monkeys jump, where the eternals meet for offering worship to Him: of Him who is resting on the serpent at Śrīraṅgam; and above that the incomparable lotus place of birth of Brahman, have become the breath of my heart indeed.

In this third verse beginning with the third letter of the Praṇava, which esoterically represents the souls, the āḷvār illustrates how they behave, and reveals his own experience. The monkeys here symbolise the inconstant and wavering souls which hanker after low fruits and puerile ends. The gods too gather on the mountain of Veṅgadam for worshipping its Lord; the eternals too who are more than gods because they are beyond the pale of *saṁsāra*. are devoted only to the service of the Supreme Lord or godhead. The Lord of Veṅgadam is thus the supreme Object of the bound souls as well as the freed and eternally free souls He is also the Object of worship for Brahman who is born of His navel.

Thus the meaning of the word *'Ādi'* (Origin) mentioned in the first hymn gets illuminated. The beauty of the waist and the navel above it is thus enjoyed.

The fourth hymn states the destinction of the ten-headed rākṣasa-King (Rāvaṇa) who by his *tapas* gained boons from gods like Brahman and Rudra. It shews that the boons granted by these lesser gods are firstly capable of causing inordinate arrogance of possession, and secondly that their boons get superseded by the Will of the Divine Lord. According to the structure of the ten hymns the first three teach the esoteric meaning of the Praṇava—of the Īśvara, Mother of Grace and the Jīva. In the fourth hymn the seeker's mind, ego, possessiveness and others and being are made to subordinate themselves to the Divine godhead of the form of Rāma, the slayer of the ten-headed rākṣasa. Thus the meaning of the speech of Surrender or abnegation to God is elucidated. Then the waist girdle enters the eye or field of Vision of the āḷvār.

1. Dusk-like sems to be more literal as a translation.

VI. Having entered, the waist-girdle is parading before my mind—the waist girdle of the Lord of Śrīraṅgam, where bees are humming and big peacocks are dancing, who has defeated the king of Laṅka girt on all sides with high walls, and cut off his ten heads with His fierce arrows, who is of the colour of the (cool) ocean :

V. Having destroyed my heavy (load of) sins, (He) who made me love Him, and for having done so, He entered my heart: what great and severe askesis did I do (to gain this love from Him) I know not. The chest of the Lord of Śrīraṅgam, adorned with mother Śrī and the pearl-garland, has made me the slave of its beauty.

VI. The neck of Him who delivered the wearer of the digit-moon of his sin, (of) the father who is residing in Śrī-raṅgam (that is) surrounded by gardens where beautiful bees are humming, who swallowed up as nectar the worlds and beyond worlds (and) the great earth with its sevenfold mountains and all, behold ! (It) has proffered me deliverance and Divine Life !

The fifth and sixth hymns reveal the auspiciousness of the Lord : for the hope of true and highest religion is the attainment of Śreyas, the true wealth of divine oneness through absolute and consecrated surrender to Him. The presence of Śrī in the chest of Māl, as an ornament and as His heart (*hṛdaya*) regarding the creation and creatures, is the most enjoyable phase of the union. The presence of Love, Mercy, overflowing grace or *dayā* for the souls is the unique fact of the nature of the deity. It is because of this the Divine creates the world, and saves the souls or redeems them or abolishes their sins which are even impossible to get rid of by means of propitiation or expiation. The Divine removes all sins along with their foul smell, root and branch, all because of the *hṛdaya* of His existence or eternal Nature, the presence of the Śrī (who is the *sampat*, wealth worldly as well as other-worldly). The divine grace is such that He removes the sin as well as the complete subordination to sense-life and becomes the master of the soul and granting it a duty to perform which would never lead it to regression into sinful conduct. Once the Divine Lord becomes the Master of the soul, the soul is from then on guided at every step by the Divine and there is only the upward movement, and regression or fall or return to the original condition becomes once for all impossible. The āḻvār not only states that the Lord removes the sin, and makes the soul his servant, but also that

the Lord enters into the soul's heart, thus making the soul the exclusive object of His enjoyment. The Lord is not only the transcendent beneficent Being but also the inner *antaryāmin* and *bhoktā* of the individual. This is something that men usually arrive at or attain through great penance and prayer and sacrifices. But I have got it, says the āḷvār, out of His supreme Grace as it were in reply to my Surrender (as implied in the *Praṇava* and *Mūla* or root-mantra). Even so the grace of God is such that the Lord wears the soul in His heart and resides in a most accessible place and in an easily enjoyable form of beauty at Śrīraṅgam. As the most beautiful Being He is adorned with the pearl-garland; to beauty all are beholden and are dependent. Thus the Lord more than all the objects of senses grants the fullest delight to the transformed senses of devotion.

Śrī Veṅkaṭanātha states that in this hymn the following meanings are enunciated:—i) The destruction of evil; ii) the attainment of the desirable; iii) the pervasion of the Divine Lord inside and outside of oneself; iv) the eternal and unceasing mercifulness of the Lord; v) the accessibility of the Divine which is the essential condition of all kinds of Means (*upāya*); vi) the possession of the Form which permits the wearing of the individual soul or Mother or other powers and the worlds even as ornaments or articles of personal enjoyment, *bhūṣaṇa*; vii) the masterhood (*svāmitva*) which is the essence of the Goal of man; viii) the husband of Śrī, the Supreme Mother of all, pointing to the inseparable quality of beneficence and fullness of plenitude of Grace in all respects; ix) The dependence-nature of the soul who is designated as '*Nāra*';[1] and x) the fruits of servanthood is ever-vigilant service of the Divine (*kaiṅkarya*). These ten meanings are incorporated in the hymn, and these should be fully grasped when meditating on this verse.

A hymn being at once a prayer and a praise reveals the intimate relationship between the devotee and the Lord and reveals all the characteristics of both, and even the process of relating.

VII. The lips of the wonderful Person, who in His two hands holds the beautiful conch and the foe-annihilating disc, whose beautiful body is like that of the mountain (green): who is adorned with fragrant Tulasī-garland and wears the crown of sovereignty, (who is) my father who resides at Śrīraṅgam which is an ornament,

1. Nāra is the word used for the soul: *Manu.* I. 10.

having reclined on the serpent-bed—have attracted my mind.

VIII. The dark, broad eyes shining with red lines and long in His face who tore the body of the big asura,[1] who is the friend of the immortals, the primeval cause, the saviour, the pure Person residing at Śrīraṅgam,—have made me entranced in it.

IX. The child Divine on the small leaf of the great Banyan tree, who swallowed up the seven worlds, now residing in Śrīraṅgam seated on the serpent, (with) the beautiful gem-garlands, pearl-garlands, and His blue body that is incomparable, That has now taken full possession my of mind (heart).

X. The cloud-hued cowherd, butter-mouthed, has stolen my heart: These mine eyes which have beheld Him, the Lord of those beyond the egg[2] residing in the beautiful Śrīraṅgam, my nectar, can see nought else.[3]

II

MADHURAKAVI ĀḶVĀR.

INTRODUCTION

Madhurakavi āḷvār is considered to be one of the āḷvārs since he discovered the āḷvārs and indeed the supreme āḷvār Śaṭhakopa, whose disciple he became. The story goes that Madhurakavi who was searching for the highest master in the North saw a star, even like the Magis who saw the star of Bethelem, but in the South. Following its course southwards, the land of Agastya, he reached the City—Tirunagari—which since then had the honour of being called

1. Hiraṇyakaśipu who was slain by Narasiṁha.

2. The created world of conditioned space and time. The egg reveals the notion of space that is limited but unbound as Einstein would say.

3. The meaning is that they cannot be made to see any thing at all other than the Divine Supertranscendental form, the form that Mārkaṇḍeya saw, and Tirumaḻiśai enjoyed, the Māyā-form of the Divine. It may mean that the āḷvār had indeed sought mergence in that form of the Divine. The story runs that when he was taken into the sanctum sanctorum of Śrīraṅgam temple by Lokasāraṅgamahāmuni and after he had sung the last hymn he was absorbed into the image. But the ideal he desclaims may be that He saw nothing without Him for He saw everything within Him and of Him and nothing else was perceived except He, Vāsudeva. Transformed, divinised utterly by the Lord's grace there was thereafter no seeing apart from or outside of or indeed other than Himself.

Āḻvār Tirunagari. Under a big and huge tamarind tree[1] was seated the eternally youthful Śaṭhakopa wrapt in supreme contemplation of the Divine Krishna who had permitted Himself to be caught up in the loving embracing meditation of the devotee, even as he did when his mother Yaśodā tied him up. The sage-āḻvār Śaṭhakopa who had conquered the circle of births opened his eyes when the searching disciple Madhurakavi found that the Star he had been following stopped just above the tree. Madhurakavi in reverence having done obeisance asked him "*Śettattin vayaṟṟile śiriyadu pirandāl ettattinreṅge kidakkum*". (When the soul is born of the Inconscient (*śettatu*) (or Matter, *acit*) what enjoying where does it be?) Śaṭhakopa replied "Enjoying that it remains there" (*Attaittinraṅge kiḍakkum*). On hearing this, knowing that the saint seated under the tree to be omniscient, Madurakavi placed himself under him for the sake of attaining salvation.

Madhurakavi's compositions might have been many as his name signifies. But we have only ten verses—*Kanninum śiruttāmbu*; these are the only verses that have come down to us. It is considered that these ten verses reveal the supreme poetic quality of the poet we are considering. The original melody of the verses I am afraid cannot be transmitted through any translation. I shall first place before the readers a translation of the ten verses and then try to point out the philosophical implications of the poem.

I. Leaving the Great wonderful Lord Father who permitted Himself to be bound by the many-knotted short piece of cord by the gentle damsel,[2] seeking refuge in the seer of Kurukūr,[3] if one recites his name,

then the tongue trained to taste from beginningless time inferior enjoyments, will begin to taste nectar.

II. Praising him with my tongue, (have I) gained the Good: his golden feet attained: verily I know of no other Godhead.

1. The tamarind tree is associated with St. Saṭhakopa who is well-known as the greatest Tamil Hymnist and musician *per excellence* in earliest times. We find that Than Sen the most celebrated poet and musician of Rajputana was also connected with a tamarind tree. His grave is overshadowed at Gwalior by this tree and it is considered that he who takes these leaves would get a 'portion of his immortal harmony.' cf. *Popular Poetry of the Hindoos* by Thomas Duer Broughton 1814.

2. Yaśodā the foster mother of Srīkṛṣṇa.

3. Saṭhakopa or Nammāḻvār.

Sweetly singing the hymns of the friend of Kurukūr[1]
I shall wander.

III. Wandering thus I have attained the vision of the form of the blue-hued Lord of the Gods with the beautiful Śrī.

This indeed is the gain that I have got by devoting myself to the Āḷvār of Kurukūr city.[2]

IV. Verily am I deemed as wretched by the very well-versed in the four Vedas.

Therefore is Śaṭhakopa who is my mother and father and ruler, the abolisher of my sorrows.

V. Previously had I desired the supreme self-realisation of the transcendent Lord: and desired too chaste ladies. (But now) having sought refuge with love in the Āḷvār of Kurukūr of golden and shining mansions, I have become realised.

VI. From now on and in future my master has favoured me with the command to sing his excellent qualities.

The Āḷvār of the mountain girt Kurukūr of big houses at all times is looking at me (showering his grace on me): behold!

VII. My master Āḷvār who was of the Kāri-family seeing me, accepting me and abolishing my age-long sins has displayed his love (to me).

I proclaim aloud the love of Śaṭhakopa alone who sang in Tamil so that persons in all diverse directions (in Tamil-land) may hearken.

VIII. (The Āḷvār) who has adored the love of God, proclaimed with joy the meaning of the well-known Vedas. You have seen the love of that lover of God who has sung on Him thousand essenceful hymns in Tamil: In this world they are beyond comparison.

IX. He (āḷvār) having sung the esoteric teaching of the Vedas of the eminent Brahmans fixed them well in my mind:

Absolute loving service of him alone is the adequate offering to my master Śaṭhakopa.

1. Ibid.
2. Ibid.

X. Though there is no gain for you (from us): though we are unwilling to hearken to the good, yet by thine actions hast thou trained us fully well, O Āḷvār of Kurukūr girt with gardens resounding with koil-cries and thine songs!

I seek thine excellent feet out of love (for thee).

XI. In these songs by the devoted Madhurakavi on his master of beautiful Kurukūr, who is the lover of all those who have sought refuge at the feet of the lover of all (God), those who have faith, will verily attain Vaikuṇṭha.

The first hymn speaks of the wonderful enjoyability of the Āḷvār who is a god-intoxicated person, who has indeed roped in the Divine Lord by his praise and hymn. The dynamic quality of the hymns is such that it is capable of weaning away the soul from its lesser enjoyments and tastes and goals. The second hymn shews that the Kavi attained the realisation of the fullest being who in himself contains the Godhead. The God-realised soul is indeed the Godhead for the devotee, the living truth and expression of the Divine. This incessant worship of the God-realised leads to the vision of the Supreme through the grace of the Divine Master. This is the truth enunciated in the third hymn, and the fourth reveals that for such a person who is devoted to the God-realised being, in whom the Divine indwells by special presence, eternally and inseparably, that Master becomes the mother and the father and redeemer and ruler. Indeed the Master is all, however low he may be in the estimation of the learned. God is not so enchanting as the God-possessing Master, and to sing the praises of the Divine-Fulfilling Master at His behest is the only duty. The Master is not a tyrant but a sweet lover, teacher of the truth. Man's offering in return for that overwhelming love of the Master to all his disciples, is to love Him by loving adoration and service. His selfless love for us demands from us a selfless return; and devotion is the essence of this offering.

HUMOUR IN SANSKRIT PLAYS

BY

P. V. RAMANUJASWAMI, M. A.

II.

Of the thirteen dramas attributed to Bhāsa several treat of episodes from the Epics, the *Mahābhārata* and the *Rāmāyaṇa* and one deals with the boyish adventures of Śrī Kṛṣṇa as depicted in the tenth skandha of the *Bhāgavata*. The *Rāmāyaṇa* plays are the *Pratimānāṭaka* and the *Abhiṣekanāṭaka*. The part of the story of Rāma described in the Ayodhya and the Araṇya kāṇḍas of the *Rāmāyaṇa* is dramatised in the former while that depicted in the succeeding three kāṇḍas forms the plot of the latter. Being pervaded with the sentiment of *Vīra* and *Karuṇa*, the story of Rāma offers little scope for the element of humour. That is why in none of the Rāma–plays do we find the character of Vidūṣaka who supplies most of the humour in the Saṁskrit plays. The *Bālacarita*, recounting the early adventures of Śrī Kṛṣṇa from his birth to the slaying of Kaṁsa, also offers little scope for humour as his adventures are mostly in the form of the destruction of the different demons sent by Kaṁsa to destroy him. The half-a-dozen *Mahābhārata* plays recount some heroic deeds accomplished by the Kaurava and the Pāṇḍava heroes and so offer, similarly, little scope for the exhibition of humour. The *Ūrubhaṅga* describes the single combat with the maces between the hero, Duryodhana and Bhīma and the breaking of the thighs (*ūru*) of the former by the latter in the end. This is the closing fight in the Great Bhārata Battle. The *Karṇabhāra* describes the generosity of Karṇa in giving away his ear-ornaments and armour to Indra who appears before him in the form of a suppliant Brahman. The embassy of Śrī Kṛṣṇa to Duryodhana on the eve of the Great Battle with the object of securing a portion of the kingdom for the Pāṇḍavas and thus averting the terrible battle ending in the whole-sale massacre of the warriors of India is the subject-matter of the *Dūtavākya*. The *Dūtaghaṭotkaca* depicts a similar incident invented by the author. After the Kauravas had slain the lonely Abhimanyu inside the *padmavyūha*, Śrī Kṛṣṇa sends Ghaṭotkaca as an envoy to the Kauravas with the message that as the Kauravas have killed Abhimanyu and caused sorrow of son's death to him, Arjuna has vowed to destroy all the Kauravas and cause sorrow of destruction of all sons to Dhṛtarāṣṭra. Duryodhana laughs away the message and says

that he will answer by means of his missiles when Śrī Kṛṣṇa is by the side of the Pāṇḍavas on the battle-field. The two last named pieces being concerned with political intrigue, there is no scope for humour in them The plot of *Madhyamavyāyoga* is also invented by the author. The story is similar to that of Ṛcika in the *Rāmāyaṇa.* A brahman, Keśavadāsa by name, is obstructed by Ghaṭotkaca, while he is travelling through the forest with his wife and three sons. Ghaṭotkaca wants to carry away one of the three sons for his mother to break her fast with him. The father does not like to part with his eldest son and the mother, the youngest. The middle one (*madhyama*) is consequently sacrificed. Before he follows the demon, he takes the latter's permission to quench his thirst in a lake close by. While he tarries there, Ghaṭotkaca calls out "*Madhyama, Madhyama*" to which Bhīmasena responds as he is the middle one of the sons of Kuntī and presents himself on the spot. He promises the father who supplicates to him protection to the middle son and offers himself in the place of the brahman's son. When she sees him, Hiḍimbā recognises her lord and introduces him to her son. The father and the son rejoice at their meeting with each other. There is very little scope for humour in the plot but the manner in which Bhīmasena and Ghaṭotkaca accost each other and engage themselves in single combat is full of light humour, as the former knows the identity of the latter but not the latter that of the former. Real humour arises only from situations in which the actors are labouring under misapprehension while the audience is in possession of the real state of affairs. Bhīmasena supplies humour by frustrating every attempt of Ghaṭotkaca to compel him to follow the latter but in the end follows him when Ghaṭotkaca reminds him of his promise to do so. *Pañcarātra* is the sixth drama based on the *Mahābhārata* but unlike the previous ones, it consists of three acts. The story centres round the *Uttaragograhaṇa* incident in the *Virāṭaparvan.* At the conclusion of the Rājasūya sacrifice which he successfully performs, Duryodhana prompts his preceptor, Droṇācārya to ask a boon which he promises to fulfil as his *Gurudakṣiṇā.* Droṇācārya asks for the granting of the half share of the kingdom to the Pāṇḍavas, as reward for his trouble in instructing Duryodhana in archery. To keep up his promise Duryodhana agrees to do so although he is warned not to do so by his uncle, Śakuni, but he stipulates, what his uncle considers to be, an impossible condition. If the preceptor can produce the Pāṇḍavas before the expiry of five days, Duryodhana promises to give them their half-share of the kingdom. As they are living incognito some-

where, Droṇācārya at first despairs of fulfilling the stipulated condition; but on hearing just at that moment that all the brothers-in-law of King Virāṭa (the Kīcakas) have been slain in a night by someone without the help of any weapon and being assured by Bhīṣma that the feat must be that of Bhīma, he agrees to the condition and promises to trace the Pāṇḍavas before the end of the stipulated period. To prosecute their object, Bhīṣma and Droṇa instigate Duryodhana to invade the territory of Virāṭa and capture his cattle as a punishment for his haughtiness in not responding to the invitation of Duryodhana to attend his sacrifice although Virāṭa excused himself from attending owing to the sorrow due to the annihilation of all his hundred brothers-in-law Duryodhana approves of this suggestion and starts on the march. Abhimanyu, who has been at the court of Duryodhana, follows him. The Kauravas are foiled in their attempt to capture the cattle of Virāṭa by Arjuna and Bhīma who let them go but capture Abhimanyu and carry him captive to the court of Virāṭa. On the way to the court, Bhīma and Arjuna accost Abhimanyu and their conversation is full of humour. They know the identity of Abhimanyu but the latter does not know with whom he is talking and this circumstance provides room for much humour. Abhimanyu considers that his opponents are intending to offend him by means of their insulting questions and exhibits pride and dignity which becomes a source of immense fun to his fathers and consequently to the audience. The conversation between the son and his fathers deserves to be reproduced here.

Bhīma and Arjuna first accost Abhimanyu by his Christian name and enquire about his mother and uncle, Kṛṣṇa. Abhimanyu's dignity is stung to the quick and he feels insulted when addressed by his Christian name, instead of by the patronymic name and when enquired about the welfare of his mother, a lady, first and then of an uncle, similarly named, who is to be venerated by the whole world.

Bhīmasenaḥ — *Abhimanyo.*
Abhimanyuḥ — *Abhimanyur nāma.*
Bṛhannalā — *Abhimanyo.*
Abhimanyuḥ — *Katham katham. Abhimanyur nāmāham. Bhoḥ, nīcair apy abhibhāṣyante nāmabhiḥ kṣatriyānvayāḥ ihāyaṁ samudācāro grahaṇam paribhūyate.*
Bṛhannalā — *Abhimanyo, sukham āste te jananī.*
Abhimanyuḥ— *Katham katham, jananī nāma.*
kim bhavān Dharmarājo me Bhīmaseno Dhanañjayaḥ
yan māṁ pitṛvadākramya strīgatām pṛcchase kathām.

Bṛhannalā — *Abhimanyo, api kuśalī Devakīputraḥ Keśavaḥ.*

Abhimanyuḥ— *Kathaṁ tatrabhavantam api nāmnā. Athakim athakim. Kuśalī bhavatā saṁsṛṣṭaḥ* (ubhau parasparam avalokayataḥ.)

A true Kṣatriya cannot suffer to be addressed by his Christian name by a stranger who appears to be a menial; much more so by one who appears to be a maid-servant. Abhimanyu is a captive in the hands of his enemies. He frets and fumes under the insult but is helpless and is unable to do anything. He is in this wretched state because he does not know with whom he is talking. If he should know it, he would be too glad to be addressed by them in that manner. But Bhīma and Arjuna know very well with whom they are talking and so they address him appropriately and they laugh at Abhimanyu's misapprehension. We are in possession of the whole information and enjoy the humour along with Bhīma and Arjuna. While this is a fine example of the humour of dignity, the continuation of the scene serves as an equally good example of humour of pride. Bhīma and Arjuna deride him for being captured and say that his conduct is unfitting the son of Arjuna and nephew of Kṛṣṇa. Abhimanyu's pride is roused and he justifies his conduct by saying that in honour to his father and uncle he could not have acted otherwise.

Abhimanyuḥ— *Kathaṁ idanīṁ sāvajñam iva māṁ hasyate.*

Bṛhannalā — *Na khalu kiñcit*
Pārtham pitaram uddiśya mātulaṁ ca Janārdanam
taruṇasya kṛtāstrasya yukto yudhaparājayaḥ.

Abhimanyuḥ— *Alam ātmastavaṁ kartun nāsmākam ucitaṁ kule*
Hateṣu hi śarān paśya nāma nānyad bhaviṣyati.

Bṛhannalā — *Evaṁ vākyaśauṇḍīryam.*
Kim arthaṁ tena padātinā gṛhītaḥ

Abhimanyuḥ— *Aśastro mām abhigatas tato'smi grahaṇaṁ gataḥ*
nyastaśastraṁ hi ko hanyād Arjunam pitaraṁ smaran.

A little further down in the scene, Abhimanyu is too proud to salute Virāṭa as king and cannot brook to be said to have been captured by Bhīma. He says he desisted from fighting as Bhīma approached him unarmed and could not as a warrior honourably fight with Bhīma to save himself. When Bhīma says that his arms are his arms, Abhimanyu humorously taunts him that he can say so if he were Bhīma, his uncle. This scene reminds one of that in the fourth Act of the *Uttararāmacarita* in which Candraketu engages

himself in altercation with Lava — the latter knowing the identity of the former but not *vice versa.*

As the *Cārudatta* is an abridgment of the first four Acts of the *Mṛcchakaṭika,* the humorous passages contained in it are all taken from the play of Śūdraka and so they need not be treated again here. But the *Avimāraka* is an independent play of the author with its plot borrowed from some unknown source, perhaps the *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya. The plot is simple. Kuraṅgī is the daughter of Kuntibhoja whose two sisters, Sucetanā and Sudarśanā, are respectively the queens of Sauvīra and Kāśī. Avimāraka is the son of Sundarśanā but is fostered by Sucetanā. His Christian name is Viṣṇusena but he is usually termed Avimāraka as he vanquished a demon called Avi. By the curse of an irascible sage, the king of Sauvīra with his family is turned into an outcaste for a year and he is spending the year incognito in the city of Kuntibhoja. One day Princess Kuraṅgī is frightened by a mad elephant in a park and Avimāraka who happens to be strolling nearby sees it and saves her. Mutual admiration ripens into love and Avimāraka, with the help of a maid of Kuraṅgī, enters her palace and lives there enjoying her company for nearly a year. Suspecting mischief, King Kuntibhoja orders vigilant guard over the princess's palace and Avimāraka fortunately escapes unobserved. Despaired of reunion with his sweetheart, Avimāraka attempts to commit suicide by falling from a cliff but is saved by a Vidyādhara who gives him a magic ring by the help of which the prince, along with his boon companion, re-enters the princess's palace unseen by others. Not knowing the whereabouts of his brother-in-law and his son, Avimāraka for a year, King Kuntibhoja decides to bestow his daughter on Jayavarman, son of Sudarśanā, his other sister and invites him to his palace with his mother. No sooner do they arrive in his palace than he learns from his spies that the king of Sauvīra is living incognito with his family in his own city and sends for him. While he is in a dilemma as to which nephew may receive the hand of his daughter, Saint Nārada appears on the scene and reveals the secret marriage of Avimāraka with Kuraṅgī and satisfies Sudarśanā by making Kuraṅgī's sister her daughter-in-law. The boon companion of the hero is Santuṣṭa and he is the chief source of humour in the drama, which is however of the light variety.

The first humorous scene in the drama is the Interlude between the first and second Acts in which a Ceṭī engages herself in conversation with the Vidūṣaka to divert herself and while away her time. He is easily taken in by her words and in prospect of a sumptuous

dinner allows himself to be robbed of his ring. She pretends to be in conversation with another maid in search of a brahman for *nimantraṇa* within his hearing and he offers himself for the purpose, only to be rejected by her on the ground of his illiteracy. He however overcomes the objection by accepting the invitation to dine without any *dakṣiṇā*. Having won his confidence by the offer of dinner, she asks him to show her his beautiful ring. On receiving the ring, she announces the approach of his friend, Avimāraka and the Vidūṣaka, taking the false scent, withdraws his eyes from her and looks about him for his friend. The maid gives him the slip and escapes through the crowd with his ring. The conversation throughout the scene is full of wit and humour and concludes with the following speeches.

Cetī — *Vilobhido muddhabamhaṇo. Imaṁ jaṇasamūham pavisia caüppahamagge vañcia gamissaṁ* (niṣkrāntā)

Vidūṣakaḥ—(Sarvato vilokya) *Candie Candie; kahim kahim Candiā. Hā vaṁcidomhi. Gaṇḍabhedadāsīe sīlaṁ jāṇanto vi attaṇo bhoaṇavissambheṇa chalidomhi.* (parikramya) *Bhoaṇaṁ vi aliaṁ cintemi.* (agrato vilokya) *Hanta esā dhāvaï. Ciṭṭha ciṭṭha, adhammiṭṭha dāsi ciṭṭha. Kiṁ dhāvaï eva. Jāva ahaṁ vi dhāvāmi.* (dhāvati) *Mama pādā siviṇe hatthiṇā āsādiamāṇassa via tahiṃ tahiṃ evva paḍanti. Hanta kumbhadāsīe vuttantaṁ tattahodo nivedayissaṁ* (miṣkrāntaḥ)

Avimāraka escapes from the palace of the Princess when his presence has been detected by her father and roams about in despair and finally determines to put an end to his unhappy life by falling from a cliff. A Vidyādhara accidentally meets him and presents him a magic ring. A man can become invisible by wearing it on his right finger and go anywhere unnoticed; but if he wears it on his left finger, he will become visible to all. With the aid of this ring Avimāraka determines to re-enter the palace of the Princess and live happily with her. But this time he wants to take his companion, Santuṣṭa, also with him, as the Vidyādhara told him that not only the man who wears the ring will become invisible but also he who touches him and he who touches the latter. The Vidūṣaka is overjoyed to meet his friend, the hero, after a long time and asks him what he has been doing all these days. The hero replies by putting the ring on his right finger. The Vidūṣaka loses sight of his friend and calls out for him. The hero puts the ring on his left finger and reappears to the Jester. The Jester humorously remarks that he

had formerly the pure Avimāraka for his friend but now he has a false Avimāraka! At the bidding of the hero, the Jester catches hold of his arm and himself becomes invisible. Then he humorously remarks:

acchariam acchariaṁ. ahaṁ pi dāva adisso. mama sarīram atthi vā natthi vā. ucchiṭṭhaṁ karissaṁ, thu thu.

When they both enter the palace of the Princess and see her, she is about to commit suicide in despair of meeting with her lover again. The hero appears before her and prevents her from the rash deed. They embrace each other and shed tears of joy. The Jester foolishly misunderstands them to be weeping and tries to shed forced tears in sympathy. The hero rebukes him for his simplicity saying *alam utprahasitena. acchalo hi sneho nāma.* While the hero and the heroine are in this ecstacy of joy, the maid Nalinikā enters and the hero asks the Jester to open the door for her. On seeing the Jester the maid expresses surprise at the presence of a male in the apartment of the Princess. The Jester then humorously tells her that she is mistaken and affirms that he is a female. When she asks the hero who he is, the Jester says he is a maid by name Puṣkariṇī. When the hero tells her that the Jester is his friend, she says she recollects him to be the Brahman usually seen at the confectioner's. Then the Jester cuts a joke at his own expense and says he is a Brahman only by the token of his sacred thread but is a monk by virtue of his dirty garments. A little later when the maid, Nalinikā, tries to lead the Jester by the hand out of the apartment, at the suggestion of the hero, he cries out *abrahmaṇyam abrahmaṇyam,* whereupon the heroine remarks that he causes fun. The Jester humorously retorts that it is only the heroine that is causing fun by undertaking to do a rash deed (i. e., suicide) and forgetting all about it on hearing the thunder. The subsequent conversation between the Jester and the maid ending with their exit is equally humorous.

The *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* is a drama of political intreague like the *Mudrārākṣasa.* Udayana, king of Kauśāmbī, is the rival of Mahāsena of Ujjayinī who is the most powerful king at the time in India. Mahāsena manages to take Udayana captive by means of a wooden elephant with the object of marrying his daughter, Princess Vāsavadattā, to him. Yaugandharāyaṇa, minister of Udayana, by means of his machinations, manages the escape of Udayana from confinement, carrying away the Princess with him and thus frustrates the attempt of Mahāsena to celebrate the marriage in his city. Mahā-

sena permits his daughter to elope with Udayana and sends his son to Kauśāmbī to celebrate the marriage there. The plot of the drama affords little scope for humour but in a single scene, where Mahāsena and his queen Aṅgāravatī, ponder over the marriage of their daughter, the queen in her anxiety about the marriage of her daughter and sorrow at her consequent separation from her, talks inconsistantly and causes fun. She daily urges Mahāsena to find a suitable husband for her daughter and when the latter thinks of selecting a husband she dissuades him from the task saying that her daughter is still too young to be married.

Rājā :— *Bhoḥ, nityaṁ pradīyatām ity asmān uparudhya, kim idānīṁ santapyase.*

Devī :— *Abhippedaṁ me padāṇaṁ. Vioö māṁ santāvedi. Aha kassa uṇa diṇṇā.*

Rājā :— *Na tāvan niścayo gamyate.*

Devī :— *Idānim pi ṇa dāva.*

* * * *

Devī :— *Kiṁ sambandho ṇiccido.*

Rājā :— *Na tāvan niścayo gamyate.*

Devī :— *Alaṁ dāṇi tuvaria. Bālā me dāriā.*

First the queen is anxious that the alliance is not yet settled and the next moment she remarks that her daughter is still young and there is no hurry to settle the alliance. This is maternal anxiety and we enjoy the humour of anxiety here. Mahāsena aptly remarks :

adattety āgatā lajjā datteti vyadhitam manaḥ
dharmasnehāntare nyastā duḥkhitāḥ khalu mātaraḥ.

The *Svapnavāsavadatta* is of course the author's masterpiece and is undoubtedly the most important drama of the group. It treats of the political alliance of Udayana with Padmāvatī, Princess of Magadha, brought about by the talented minister, Yaugandharāyaṇa. Although the plot centres round a marriage, still as it is brought about at the expense of the separation of Udayana and Vāsavadattā, it is pervaded more by melancholy atmosphere which offers little scope for humour. The traditional Jester of Udayana is Vasantaka and he is present in this drama too but opportunities do not present themselves to him to show his talents. Once in the Interlude between the third and fourth Acts, in his conversation with the maid-servant, he makes a reference to the table but it falls flat on her ears as she is busy with more important things. In the fourth Act, the conversation

between the King and the Jester touching Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī is slightly humorous although it is full of pathos. The Jester presses the King to tell him who is more dear to him, Vāsavadattā then or Padmāvatī now but when the King says that he cannot extract the opinion from him by force, the Jester comes round and entreats him to express his opinion. Next it is the King's turn and he presses the Jester to tell him who is more dear to him, Vāsavadattā then or Padmāvatī now. The Jester retorts that the King cannot have his opinion by force. The Jester gives his opinion in favour of Padmāvatī because she shows particular attention to the Jester's dinner. The King is overpowered by his remark and unwarily says that he will report his conduct to Vāsavadattā whereat the Jester pokes fun at him and reminds him that she has disappeared long ago. This is pathetic humour and this is the utmost that the Jester can do in the drama.

We thus see that the sentiment of humour is very meagrely represented in this group of dramas, and even where it is found, it is not of a very high order. If the whole group of dramas is from the pen of a single author, he occupies a very low position among the Sanskrit dramatists in the depiction of humour, whatever may be his abilities in other directions.

If we turn to the dramas of Bhavabhūti and compare them with those of the other poets, we find that Bhavabhūti lacks humour in the extreme. As a dramatist, Bhavabhūti can stand comparison with Kālidāsa and Śūdraka and certainly surpasses Śrīharṣa and the author of *Avimāraka* and other dramas of the group. Kālidāsa and Bhavabūti are distinctly Indian in thought and manners while Śūdraka is cosmopolitan. Kālidāsa is expert in depicting the tender sentiment of love while Bhavabhūti excells in the delineation of the stronger sentiments of heroism and pathos. Humour, being light, can match only with love and not with either heroism or pathos. Kālidāsa's description of heroism or valour is as feeble as Bhavabhūti's description of love. Kālidāsa's three dramas depict the sentiment of love and in this way he excels in his choice. Bhavabhūti too has three dramas to his credit and centres each on a different sentiment. In addition to heroism in the *Mahāvīracarita* and pathos in the *Uttararāmacarita*, he tries to depict love in the *Mālatīmādhava* and fails miserably as the sentiment is beyond his talents. Kālidāsa's love is more romantic being of the second or subsequent marriages while that of Bhavabhūti is more pure and idealistic, being that of the first marriage. The *Vikramorvaśīya* describes the second courting

of King Purūravas and the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, the third courting of King Agnimitra, while the *Śakuntalā* describes at least the fourth courting of King Duṣyanta, as he himself admits that he is endowed with *parigrahabahutva*. Mādhava and Makaranda, on the other hand, are indulging in first love. Besides, the love depicted by Bhavabhūti is more orthodox, being that of a brahman couple, than that by Kālidāsa which is more unfettered, being that of the kings. As the hero of a *Prakaraṇa* cannot be a royal personage but must of necessity be a Brahman or Vaiśya, the sentiment of love in this species of drama cannot be of the romantic type. This is the main reason for the absence of the character of Vidūṣaka in the *Prakaraṇa* although the prevailing sentiment of it is love. Bhavabhūti intermixes heroism, pathos, wonder, terror and disgust with love but not humour, while Kālidāsa has love mixed with heroism, pathos, wonder as well as humour. The reason perhaps lies in the character of the two poets. Kālidāsa had more experience of love and humour in him while Bhavabhūti had more of seriousness and reserve.

Bhavabhūti can conceive humorous situations but cannot describe them while Kālidāsa and Śūdraka can describe more beautifully. The marriage of Nandana with Makaranda in female attire in the *Mālatimādhava* is really humorous in conception but its description spoils the humour. Neither the marriage nor the meeting of the false lovers is presented to our eyes to stir our humour but they are both reported to us to brood over the scenes. In the *Mahāvīracarita* which treats of the story of Rāma, the incident of Śūrpaṇakhā, the only humorous episode in the story of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is unfortunately omitted from being represented but is only reported in the fifth Act. The *Uttararāmacarita* treats of the later life of Rāma and as that portion of Rāma's life is pervaded with sorrow, there is no scope at all for the exhibition of humour in the drama. But the author tries to create one humorous scene in the fifth Act out of the conversation between the two young Princes, Candraketu and Lava. But he hopelessly fails in his attempt as the scene flavours more of heroism than humour and the little humour that is sought to be produced is at the expense of the character of Śrī Rāma and so falls flat on our ears. Thus though Bhavabhūti is proficient in the Vedas and the śāstras, and has supreme command over the language and exhibits grandeur in style and loftiness in conception and excellently matches sound with sense, still he is miserably lacking in the sense of humour and fails to excite fun in us.

TAMILIAN COSMETICS

BY

T. P. PALANIAPPA PILLAI, B O.L.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines the term cosmetics as the art of adorning or beautifying the body and traces its origin from the middle of the 17th century and shows its standardization in the 18th century. Though this term may embrace diverse ways of adornment it seems to be restricted in use to the preparations for beautifying the the hair, skin or complexion These consist of washes, pastes, powders and pomades which serve to remove from the skin any discoloration, freckle or pimples and help in the healthy growth and aid to the charming look of the person. Since the desire of beautifying the body is found universal among men, the people of all the countries of the world have naturally adopted various modes of beautification subject to the influence of their times and climes. As a result of advancement in the knowledge of manifold arts and sciences, westerners have produced literature dealing with cosmetics as an important branch of modern knowledge, and scholars in Indian languages prompted by curiosity to compare their own old literary notices, endeavour to discover them in their respective literatures. And I propose in the following pages to deal with certain aspects of Tamilian cosmetics as gleaned from the ancient literature of the Tamils.

Before proceeding to detail them, let me make some general observations. In the Tamil kāvya *Māṇimēkalai* we find that mention is made of cosmetics as a standardized art and that it was practised by the courtezans of the earlier centuries thus :—

வேத்தியல் பொதுவிய லென்றிரு திறத்துக்
கூத்தும் பாட்டுந் தூக்குந் துணிவும்
பண்ணியாழ்க் கரணமும் பாடைப் பாடலுந்
தண்ணுமைக் கருவியுந் தாழ்தீங் குழலுங்
கந்துகக் கருத்து மடைநூற் செய்தியுஞ்
சுந்தரச் சுண்ணமுந் தூநீ ராடலும்
பாயற் பள்ளியும் பருவத் தொழுக்கமுங்
காயக் கரணமுங் கண்ணிய துணர்தலுங்
கட்டுரை வகையுங் கரந்துறை கணக்கும்
வட்டிகைச் செய்தியு மலராய்ந்து தொடுத்தலுங்
கோலங் கோடலுங் கோவையின் கோப்பும்

காலக் கணிதமுங் கலைகளின் றுணிவு
நாடக மகளிர்க்கு நன்கனம் வகுத்த
வோவியச் செந்நூ லுரை நூற் கிடக்கையுங்
கற்றுத்துறை போகிய பொற்றொடி நங்கை (17-32—ஊரலர்)

In the above lines the phrases vaṭṭikaic-ceytiyum, (வட்டிகைச் செய்தியும்) kōlaṁkōṭalum (கோலங்கோடலும்) sundara-c-cuṇṇamum' tooni-rāṭalum (சுந்தரச் சுண்ணமுந் தூநீராடலும்), apart from kindred arts, make clear mention of the art of preparation of collyrium, its accessories and its application and the art of adorning one's person to suit to occasions and functions and the preparation of sweet smelling bathing powders. The other Tamil Kāvyas—*Silappadikāram* and *Peruṅkadai* make specific mention of sixty-four arts in which the courtezans of those days were well versed thus :—

" *பண்ணுங் கிளையும் பழித்த தீஞ்சொ*
லெண்ணெண் கலையோ ரிருபெரு வீதியும் " (166-167—ஊர்காண்)

" *எண்ணெண் கிரட்டி யிருங்கலை பயின்ற*
பண்ணியன் மடந்தையர் பயங்கெழு வீதி;" (138-9—அழல்)

" *யாழ்முதலாக வறுபத் தொருநான்*
கேரிள மகளிர் " (பெருங்கதை—1-35-84-5)

From these references we find that the courtezans of those days occupied a respectable position in society and by dint of their exclusive accomplishments in the fine arts of music, dancing, painting and allied ones, fulfilled their legitimate functions in the royal courts and temples on all occasions of regal importance and festivities. And it is evident that this art of cosmetics was develeped to a high degree along with the other allied arts in the Tamil country in early times.

I now pass on to refer to the salient aspects of the early Tamilian cosmetics. The applying of collyrium to the eyelids by women finds a conspicuous mention in all types of Tamil literature, both ancient and modern. We meet with innumerable references to the practice of applying the collyrium to the eyelids, mostly of maidens, in almost all the Sangam classics thus :—

நீலத் திணைமலர் புரையு முண்கட் கிணைமகள் (புறம்—111)
நீனிற நெய்தலிற் பொலிந்த வுண்கண் (புறம்—144)
அரிவே யுண்கண் (அகம்—390)
பூப்போ லுண்கண் (ஐங்.—161)
மைகூர்ந்து மலர்பிணைத் தன்னமாயிதழ் மழைக்கண் (நற்.—252)
நீலித முண்கண்ணாய் (கலி—33)
மைதோய் கண்ணி (பெருங்.—471)

The later Kāvyas, while describing the daily routine of the kings, make mention of the royal attendants presenting in the morning the collyrium to the king to be applied to the eyelids. The following lines from *Peruṅkadai*, 1-34-12-20 ll.

"அருந்துறை போகிய பெருந்தகை யாள
ருணர்வு மொளியு மூக்கமு முணர்ச்சியும்
புணர்வின் செல்வமும் போகமுஞ் சிறப்ப
வமிழ்தியல் யோகத் தஞ்சனம் வகுத்துக்
கமழ்கொள் பூமியிற் கபிலைமுன் னிறீஇ
மகடூஉத் துறந்த மாசறு படிவத்துத்
துகடீ ராளர்க்குத் துளக்கிய முடியன்
மலர்கண் ணலீஇய மந்திர நறுநீர்
பலருடன் வாழ்த்தப் பண்புளி யெய்தி.'—

show that as soon as the king Praccōdana got up from his bed, the palace attendants presented the medicated collyrium to the king to be applied to the eyes and that he applied it accordingly before the usual Visvarūpa darsana and his daily ablution. These lines further indicate that clear perception, brightness, agility, vitality and joviality are derived from the application of collyrium, prepared according to the principles of medicine.

Jīvakacintāmaṇi—another Tamil Kāvya, while depicting the daily routine of the king Jīvaka details his activities at day-break as follows:—

....

....

பொடித்தான் கதிரோன் றிரைநெற்றிப் புகழ்முப் பழநீர்ப் பளிங்களைஇக்
கடிப்பூ மாலை யவரேந்தக் கமழ்தா மரைக்கண் கழீஇயினான்

முனைவற் றொழுது முடிதுளக்கி முகந்து செம்பொன் கொளவீசி
நினைப லாகா நெடுவாழ்க்கை வென்றிக் கோலம் விளக்காகப்
புனையப் பட்ட வஞ்சனத்தைப் புகழ வெழுதிப் புனைபூணான்
கனைவண் டார்க்கு மலங்கலுங் கலனு மேற்பத் தாங்கினான்.

முறிந்த கோல முகிழ்முலையார் பரவ மொய்யார் மணிச்செப்பி
லுறைந்த வெண்பட் டுடுத்தொளிசேர் பஞ்ச வாசங் கவுட்கொண்டு
செறிந்த கழுநீர்ப் பூப்பிடித்துச் சேக்கை மரீஇய சிங்கம்போ
லறிந்தார் தமக்கு மநங்கனா யண்ணல் செம்மாந் திருந்தானே

(பூமகள்—30, 31, 32,)

The first stanza shows that at daybreak, the charming maiden attendants of the palace ceremoniusly presented the king with cool water in which கடுக்காய் (galnut), நெல்லிக்காய் (Indian gooseberry), தான்றிக்காய் (Myrobalans) were soaked up along with பச்சைக்கற்பூரம்

(medicated camphor) and that he washed his face with that medicated water. The second stanza states that the king finishing his daily prayers, applied to his eyes the medicated collyrium and put on his person floral and jewel garlands. The third says that the attendants presented to him formally white silken apparel for his costume and betel-nuts with their fragrant accessories for chewing.

From these two kāvyas, we see that in early times aristocratic men too took to the applying of collyrium to their eyes as their norm in life and that it was prepared with fragrant medicaments. Poet Tiruvalluvar has two couplets in his immortal Tirukkural referring to the practice of applying collyrium in his days thus :—

கண்ணுள்ளார் காத லவராகக் கண்ணு
மெழுதேங் கரப்பாக் கறிந்து (1127)

எழுதுங்காற் கோல்காணுக் கண்ணேபோற் கொண்கன்
பழிகாணேன் கண்ட விடத்து (1285)

These clearly show that the practice of appling the collyrium was in general use in his time among all classes of people and that its application was done through a nice thin black stick.

It would be surprising to note in this connection that the standard medical treatise of the Tamils prescribes among other things the regular application of the collyrium to the eyes once in every three days for the maintenance of healthy life for all people.

ஆறுதிங்கட் கொருதடவை வமனமருந் தயில்வோம்
அடர்நான்கு மதிக்கொருகாற் பேதியுறை நுகர்வாம்
தேறுமதி யொன்றரைக்கோர் தரநசியம் பெறுவோம்
திங்களரைக் கிரண்டுதரஞ் சவரவிருப் புறுவோம்
வீறுசதுர் நாட்கொருக்கா னெய்முழுக்கைத் தவிரோம்
விழிகளுக்கஞ் சனமூன்று நாட்கொருக்கா விடுவோம்
நாறுகந்தப் புட்பமிவை நடுநிசியின் முகரோம்
நமனுர்க்கிங் கேதுகவை நாமிருக்கு மிடத்தே—
—தேரையர் பதார்த்தகுண சிந்தாமணி.

The third foot of this stanza prescribes oil bath once in four days and the application of collyrium once in three days as a potent factor contributing to a healthy life. We may also note here that Vātsyāyana in his *Kāma Sūtra* states that the applying of collyrium to the eyes is one of the manifold items in the daily routine of a Nāgaraka.

Another aspect of the Tamilian cosmetics is the practice of daubing the sandal-cum-saffron paste upon the breast and shoulders

of the young maiden—the use of which is referred to in the earlier Tamil classics thus :—

பணைத்தோட் குறுமகள் பாவை தைஇயும்
பஞ்சாய்ப் பள்ளஞ் சூழ்ந்து மற்றிவள்
உருத்தெழு வனமுலை யொளிபெற வெழுதிய
தொய்யில் காப்போ ரறிதலு மறியார்.......... (குறுந்—276)
உழுந்துடைக் கழுந்திற் கரும்புடைப் பணைத்தோள் (குறுந்—384)
பிரிந்திறை சூழாதி ஐய விரும்பிநீ
என்றோ ளெழுதிய தொய்யிலும் (கலி—18)
நெய்த னெறிக்கவும் வல்ல னெடுமென்றோட்
பெய்கரும் பீர்க்கவும் வல்ல னிளமுலைமேற்
றொய்யி லெழுதவும் வல்லன் (கலி—143)
தோண்மேற் கரும்பெழுதுந் தொய்யிற்கு
நடாஅக் கரும்பமன்ற தோளாரை (கலி—112)
கரும்பும் வல்லியும் பெருந்தோ ளெழுதி (சிலப்—2—29)

This daubing is called தொய்யிலெழுதல்—toyyil drawing. It is interestiug to note that the earliest extant work in Tamil—the *Tolcāppiyam* also refers to its use among the ancient Tamils aud calls it by the name வள்ளி—signifying the form of a teudril.

வண்டே யிழையே வள்ளி பூவே
கண்ணே யலமர லிமைப்பே யச்சமென்
றன்னவை பிறவு மாங்கவ ணிகழ
நின்றவை களையுங் கருவி யென்ப (களவி—4)

In this sūtra Tolcāppiyanār states that the daubing of the sandal-saffron paste on the breast of a charming maiden is the distinguishing mark to enable a youthful lover to discover that the enchanting form of the maid of the woodland he meets with in his love-at-first-sight, is nothing but the human form in a sweet bower, and not to mistake her person for a divine appearance.

The daubing of this paste on the breast of young maiden is vividly described in *Jīvakacintāmaṇi* thus :—

சண்பக மாலை வேய்ந்து சந்தனம் பளிதந் தீற்றி
விண்புக நாறு சாந்தின் விழுமுலைக் காம வல்லி
கொண்டெழுந் துருவு காட்டி முகத்திடைக் குளித்துத் தோண்மேல்
வண்டளி ரீன்று சுட்டி வாணுதல் பூப்ப வைத்தான் (1081)

மாமணி முகடு வேய்ந்த மரகத மணிச்செப் பன்ன
தூமணி முலைக டம்மைத் தொழுதகக் கமழுஞ் சாந்திற்
காமரு காம வல்லிக் கொடிகவின் கொண்டு பூத்துத்
தூமணிக் கொழுந்து மென்றோட் டுயல்வர வெழுதினாளே. (2442)

These stanzas state that the paste is prepared by compounding together the sandalwood powder with medicated camphor and sweet smelling constituents and is drawn on the tender body of the maiden from underneath the breast in the form of a tendril sprouting its foliage on the shoulders, budding out love on the face and blossoming forth on the forehead into a charming ornament.

Silappadikāram also refers to this practice of daubing thus :—

சுரும்புணக் கிடந்த நறும்பூச் சேக்கைக்
கரும்பும் வல்லியும் பெருந்தோ ளெழுதி (2—28-9)

In these lines we find that this daubing was done in the form of a sugarcane—described in the Purāṇas as the bow of Cupid—the god of love and also in the form of a tendril designated Kāmavalli. This daubing has its relation to the love activities of youthful lovers.

Another interesting aspect of the Tamilian cosmeties is described in *Silappadikāram* This is elaborated in connection with the ablutions and adornments of the well known courtezan-Mādhavi, a feminine character in the epic, while she got ready to attend the festival of sea-bath in her city—Kāverip-pūm-paṭṭinam.

பத்துத் துவரினு மைந்து விரையினு
முப்பத் திருவகை யோமா லிகையினு
மூறின நன்னீ ருரைத்த நெய்வாச
நாறிருங் கூந்த னலம்பெற வாட்டிப்
புகையிற் புலர்த்திய பூமென் கூந்தலை
வகைதொறு மான்மதக் கொழுஞ்சே றூட்டி
யலத்தக மூட்டிய வஞ்செஞ் சீறடி
நலத்தகு மெல்விர னல்லணி செறீஇ .... (6—76-84)

The poet enumerates here that the courtezan took her ablutions with three varieties of cosmetics termed in Tamil language as துவர், (astringents) விரை (aromatics), and ஓமாலிகை (Ōmālikai), after which she dried up her dishevelled hairs with fragrant smoking and dressed her hairs with pomatum. In explaining the three different varieties of cosmetics mentioned above, the commentator Adiyārkku-nallār quotes certain old extracts presumably from a considerable treatise on cosmetics unfortunately lost in oblivion ; and I give them here under, both in the Tamil script and in its transliteration to enable scholars not conversant with Indian scripts to get at a knowledge of the ingredients of these three varieties of cosmetics.

பத்துத்துவராவன : — " பூவந்தி திரிபலை புணர்கருங் காலி
நாவ லோடு நாற்பான் மரமே "

The ten astringents are :—Pūvanti tiripalai puṇarkaruṅkāli
Nāvalōḍu nāṟpāṉ marame.

ஐந்து விரையாவன : — " கோட்டந் துருக்கந் தகர மகிலார
மோட்டிய வைந்தும் விரை "

The five aromatics are :—Kōṭṭaṁ turukkaṁ takaramahilārāṁ
Ōṭṭiya vaiṅtum virai

முப்பத் திருவகை ஓமாலிகை யாவன : —

" இலவங்கம் பச்சிலை கச்சோல மேலங்
குலவிய நாகணங் கோட்ட-நிலவிய
நாக மதாவரிசி தக்கோல நன்னாரி
வேகமில் வெண்கோட்ட மேவுசீர்—போகாத
கத்தூரி வேரி யிலாமிச்சங் கண்டில்வெண்ணெய்
ஒத்தகடு நெல்லி யுயர்தான்றி— துத்தமொடு
வண்ணக்கச் சோல மரேணுக மாஞ்சியுட
னெண்ணுஞ் சயிலேக மின்புழுகு—கண்ணுநறும்
புன்னைநறுந் தாது புலியுகிர் பூஞ்சாளம்
பின்னு தமாலம் பெரு வகுளம்—பன்னும்
பதுமுகநுண் ணேலம் பைங்கொடு வேரி
கதிர்நகையா யோமாலி கை "

The thirty two Ōmālikai are :—

Ilavaṅkam paccilai kaccolam-ēlam
Kulaviya nākaṇam kōṭṭam-nilaviya
Nāga matāvarisi takkōlam naṉṉāri
Vēkamil veṇkōṭṭam mevusir-pōkāta
Kattūri vēri ilāmiccaṁ kaṇḍilveṇṇei
Otta kaḍu nelli yuyar tāṉri- tuttamoḍu
Vaṇṇakkaccōlam arēnuka māñjiyuḍān
Eṇṇuṁ cayilēkam inpuḷugu- kaṇṇunuṟum
Puṉṉai naṟuṁ tādu puliyukir pūñjaralam
Piṉṉu tamālam peruvakulam-paṉṉuṁ
Padumuka nuṉṉēlam paiṅkoḍu vēri
Kadir nakaiyāy ōmālikai

Lastly it is said that she applied to her feet an unguent called alattakam to add a reddish charm to her beautiful little feet. This is otherwise called ceṁpañcu-k-kuḻampu செம்பஞ்சுக்குழம்பு in Tamil which is also styled as a cosmetic. The commentator also quotes another extract probably from an epic work in Tamil thus :—

" ஓரை விரையினு மீரைந் துவரினு
யாறைந்தின் மேலிரண் டோமா விகையினு
நாறைங் கதுப்பி னுமு நன்குரை இ
யூறின நன்னீ ருவந்தன னாட்டி "

in support of the wide use of these cosmetics in those days in the Tamil land.

We have now noted above that Mādhavi—the courtezan after finishing her baths applied alattakam only to her feet to add to her personal charm; but we meet with in *Jīvakacintāmaṇi* a stanza with reference to the personal embellishments of the royal maiden Ilakkaṇaiyar, which tells us that this alattakam was not only applied to her feet, but also to other limbs such as hands, lips, forehead, tongue, finger nails and the neck :—

அம்மல ரடியுங் கையு மணிகிளர் பவள வாயுஞ்
செம்மலர் நுதலு நாவுந் திருந்தொளி யுகிரோ டங்கேழ்
விம்மிதப் பட்டு வீழ வலத்தக மெழுதி யிட்டாள்
அம்மலர்க் கண்டு முள்ளிட் டரிவையைத் தெரிவை தானே. (—2446)

A significant fact with regard to the use of this cosmetic is to be noted here. The commentator Naccinārkkiniyar in commenting upon a Sutra (No. 80) of the chapter on Prosody in *Tolcāppiam* dealing with the Tamil literary conventions, quotes this stanza there and points out that the applying of this alattakam to all the above mentioned limbs had virtually fallen into disuse in his times.

Tiruttakka Deva—a Jain poet, while describing in his poem *Jivakācintāmaṇi*, the ceremonious ablutions in holy waters of the royal maid Gāndharva Datta, incidentally refers to the use of the cosmetics prevalent in those times thus :—

வாசநெய் வண்டு மூச மார்ந்தளிர் விரல்கள் சேப்பப்
பூசிவெள் ளிலோத்திரத்தின் பூம்பொருக் கரைத்த சாந்தின்
காசறு குவளைக் காம ரகவிதழ் பயில மட்டித்
தாசறத் திமிர்ந்து மாத ரணிநலந் திகழ்வித் தாரே. (—622)
கங்கையின் களிற்றி னுச்சிக் கதிர்மணிக் குடத்திற் றந்த
மங்கள வாச நன்னீர் மணிநிறங் கழீஇய தொப்ப
நங்கையை நயப்ப வெல்லாம் விரையொடு துவருஞ் சேர்த்தி
யங்கர வல்கு லாளை யாட்டினா ரரம்பை யன்னார். (—623)

The first stanza refers first to the besmearing of the sweet scented oil for oil bath and its cleansing off first with the paste prepared out of the dried flower-petals of வெள்ளி லோத்திரம் veḷḷilōttiram compounded with sandal wood pulp and the second refers to the

use of all the three varieties of cosmetics viz விரை, துவர் and ஓமாலிகை aromatics, astringents and Ōmālikai mentioned above in connection with ceremonius baths. It is to be observed here that these were used in royal households on ceremonious occasions, since we see that the royal maid had her ablutions in holy water, preparatoiy to her participation in the music competition in the play on the Viṇa.

Here the commentator Naccinār-k-kiniyar quotes some extracts enumerating the ingredients of the several cosmetic preparations and these strikingly differ from those given by Aḍiyārkkunallār. From these we are induced to infer that different sorts of cosmetic preparations under various heads were widely prevalent in those days. I adduce them here in their entirety and also a transliteration for comparison and clearer understanding.

ஓமாலிகைகளாவன : —

“ இலவங்கம் பச்சிலைகச் சோலமிரு வேரி
மலையிரு வேரி வகுளஞ் சுரபுன்னை
யேலந்தக் கோல மதாவரிசி சாதிக்காய்
நாகணமஞ் சட்டி நறும்பிசின் குக்குலு
மாஞ்சிகண் டில்வெண்ணெய் தீம்பூநன் னாரி
யடவிக்கச் சோல மாத்தை சரளம்
புழுகா ரியக்கோட்டங் கோட்டந் தகர
மதிமதுர முத்தக்கா சாய்ந்தவிலா மிச்சஞ்
சயிலேக நாகப்பூச் சண்பகமொட் டென்று
முழுதுணர்ந்தோ ரோதிய முப்பத் திரண்டே
விதிவகை யோமாலி கை.”

The Ōmālikas are :—

Ilavaṅkam paccilai kaccōlamiru vēri
Malaiyiruvēri vakulaṁ cura puṉṉai
Yēlaṁ takkōlam madāvarisi cādıkkāi
Nākanam mañcaṭṭi naṟum pisin kukkulu
Māñji kaṇḍilveṇṇei tīmpū naṉṉāri
Yaṭavi-k-kaccōlam-arattai caralam
Puḷugu-āriyak-koṭṭam kōṭṭam takaram
Adhimadhuram-muttakkāṣu-āintavilamiccañ
Cayilēkam nāgappū campaka moṭṭu eṉṟu
Mulutuṉarntōr-ōtiya muppattiraṇḍē
Vidhi vakai Ōmāli kai.

விரை : — சந்தன மகிலொடு கருப்பூரங் கத்தூரி
குங்கும மென்றிவ்வை யைந்தும் விரையே.

Virai : aromatics :—saṇtaṅam-akiloḍu karuppuraṁ kattūri
kuṅkumam-enṟivai yeintum viraiyē

துவர் : —நாற்பான் மராமா நாவல் திரிபலை
வன்கருங் காலி பத்துந் துவரே.

Tuvar : astringents—Nāṟpāṉ maramā nāval tiripalai
vaṉkaruṅkāli pattum tuvarē.

In the two different quotations of the two commentators, we notice some difference in the enumeration of the ingredients. Among the thirty two ingredients of the Ōmālikai, as many as twenty-one are common to both while eleven vary. With regard to the other two species, the variation, though little, is noticeable. It is to be noted here that most of the constituents of these cosmetics, bear indigenous Tamil names and the preparations themselves go by the purely Tamil nomenclature.

The term Ōmālikai may sound like a Sanskritic appellation but I hazard a conjecture that it is not a term of Sanskritic origin as this does not find a place in any of the Sanskrit reference books modern or ancient and is to be therefore assumed as a purely Tamilian term. It is interesting to note that these varieties of virai, tuvar, and Ōmālikai find a noteworthy mention in the other Tamil epic *Peruṅkadai* in different contexts :—

அரைப்பமை சாந்தமு முரைப்பமை நானமு
மொப்புமுறை யமைந்த வோமா லிகையும் —(1-41-126-7)
ஒண்விளைப் பொலிந்த வோமாலி கையும் —(2-5-32)

Apart from these, we meet with a sort of pomade used for hair dressing after bath in *Jīvakacintāmaṇi*.

வேனி லாடும் விருப்பினல் வியன்காய் நெல்லிச சாந்தரைத்து
நான வெண்ணெய் கதுப்புரைத்து நறுநீ ராடி யமிர்துயிர்க்குந்
தேனு ரகிலின் புகைசேர்த்தி வகுத்து நாவிக் குழம்புரீஇ
யானுப் பனித நறுஞ்சுண்ண முகிரி னுழுதாங் கணிந்தாரே —(2692)

This describes that a paste of nellik-kāi (Indian gooseberry) was used to cleanse off the fragrant oil used during oil baths, afterwhich the hairs were dried by fragrant agil smoke and then a pomatum-compound of civet and medicated camphor was applied to it.

One significant fact must be noted here. All the foregoing references show that the cosmetics were in use in the households of courtezans and royalty. Similar references in *Paripāḍal*—one of the Sangam classics, occurring in stanzas relating to the praise of the river Vaigai in its freshes, disclose to us the fact that the Tamil people in

general used to resort to the river-side while the river was in freshes and enjoy baths as if on an occasion of festivity and gaiety and that in such gay river-baths too, they were in the habit of using these cosmetics.

மண்ணார் மணியின் வணர்குரல் வண்டார்ப்பத்
தண்ணந் துவர்பல வூட்டிச் சலங்குடைவார்
எண்ணெய் கழல விழைதுகிள் பிசைவார் —(10-89-91)

சாறுஞ் சேறு நெய்யு மலரு
நாறுபு நிகழும் யாறுவர லாறு —(6-41-2)

In concluding my comprehensive presentation of references to the Tamilian cosmetics, I should not fail to bring to the notice of readers that the country turmeric has been very widely applied to the face and all over the body in baths by the women of all classes of the Tamilian Society. *Aṟaneṟic-cāram*—a Tamil work on ethics describes the conduct of a woman while her husband is away from home thus:—

அயலூ ரவன்போக வம்மஞ்ச ளாடிக்
கயலேர்கண் ணார வெழுதிப்—புயலைம்பால்
வண்டோச்சி நின்றுலாம் வாளேர் தடங்கண்ணாள்
தண்டோச்சிப் பின்செல்லுங் கூற்று. (—92)

This refers to the use of the turmeric by women in their baths. Periyālwār also refers to its use thus: "பற்றுமஞ்சள் பூசிப் பாவைமா ரொடு பாடியில்" and hence we may infer that its use was prevalent from ancient times although we scarcely meet with any mention of its use in the Sangam classics. Even at the present day Tamilian maidens consider it their sacred duty to apply turmeric to their face and use it in baths and believe it to be a holy prescription bringing them all charm, health and prosperity. *Tēraiyar*—a celebrity in Tamilian Medicinal Science describes the uses of turmeric in glowing terms thus:—

பொன்னிறமாம் மேனிப் புலானாற்ற மும்போகும்
மன்னு புருட வசியமாம்—பின்னியெழும்
வாந்திபித்த தோடமையம் வாதம்போந் தீபனமாங்
கூர்ந்தமஞ்ச ளின்கிழங்குக் கு.

தலைவலிநீ ரேற்றஞ் சளையாத மேகம்
உலைவுதரு பீநசத்தி னூடே—வலிசுரப்ப
விஞ்சு கடிவிடமும் வீறுவிர ணங்களும்போம்
மஞ்சட் கிழங்குக்கு மால்.

மஞ்சட் குளிதனக்கு மாறுத்துர்க் கந்தமொடு
விஞ்சுமுக சாட்டியமும் விட்டகலும் —தொஞ்சலுறும்
ஐய மொழியு மடர்வியர்வுங் காணுது
வைய மதனில் வழுத்து.

நீ க்கடுப்பு காசமொடு நீடு விடசுரமுந்
தீர்க்கநமைச் சல்வெப்புஞ் சேர்மலமும்—பார்க்குண்மிக
அஞ்சியே யேகுமஞ்ச ளாம்வத் திரம்புனேந்தால்
வஞ்சியே நன்றுய் வழுத்து—

Even if the western cosmetics makes an aggressive advent into the practices of the Tamilian women and tries to drive away the indigenous practices still we may be sure that the use of turmeric will continue to form a holy thing with the women of the Tamil country undiscomfited by its adversaries from the west. It is considered to be disease-preventive, health-preservative, and charm-promotive by the Tamilian medical savants.

The modern rouge—a red powder used to colour the lips artificially which plays a very prominent part in the lady's embellishments in the west, has its counterpart in the east in the use of betel-nuts that all the Tamilians generally use everyday along with their fragrant fivefold accessories called pañcavāsam constituting a compound of தக்கோலம், ஏலம், இலவங்கம், சாதிக்காய் and கற்பூரம், i.e. tailed pepper, cardamom, clove, nutmeg and medicated camphor which yield a reddish tinge to the lips and sweet smell to the breath and have a conducive effect on the digestive system of the body. That the chewing of betel-nuts was a general practice with the commonality of the Tamil country even from the very earliest times, is indubitably known from references to its use in the Sangam classical literature and it is on account of this very wide prevalence of its use then that Nammālvār, the Vaiṣṇava Saint sings in the famous line of his *Tiruvoimozhi*

"உண்ணுஞ் சோறு பருகுநீர் தின்னும் வெற்றிலையு மெல்லாம்
கண்ணனெம் பெருமா னென்றென்றே கண்கள் நீர்கள் மல்கி" (—6-7-1)

that the chewing of betel-nuts is as co-essential a norm of life as the eating of food and drinking of water are to all the Tamilians.

We also notice in the earlier classical works that there were certain well-observed regulations in the use of betel-nuts in those days. In the *Jīvakacintāmaṇi* its use is referred to in stanzas 2473 ff thus :—

அங்கருங் காலி சீவி யூறவைத் தமைக்கப் பட்ட
செங்களி விராய காயுஞ் செம்பழுக் காயுந் தீந்தே
னெங்கணுங் குளிர்த்த வின்னீ ரிளம்பசுங் காயு மூன்றுந்
தங்களி செய்யக் கூட்டித் தையலார் கைசெய் தாரோ.
கைசெய்து கமழு நூறுங் காழ்க்கும்வெள் ளிலையுங் காம
மெய்தநன் குணர்ந்த நீரா ரின்முக வாச மூட்டிப்
பெய்தபொற் செப்பும் ....

The first stanza points out that there were three different sorts of nuts to be used along with betel-leaves viz ,(1) the areca-nut soaked in the red jam made out of the scrivels of the barks of the black catechu (கருங்காலி) or ebony, (2) the ripe-red areca-nut, and (3) the tender areca-nut soaked in honey ; and the next stanza shows that the lime prepared with scents and the pungent betel-leaves were used for the chewing of betel-nuts. Just in accordance with this and in minute clarification of the same, the *Peruṅkadai kāvya*—another Tamil classical work, enjoins the regulations in the use of areca-nuts thus :—

" பைங்கருங் காலிச் செங்களி யளைஇ
நன்பகற் கமைந்த வந்துவர்க் காயும்,
இருங்கண் மாலைக்குப் பெரும்பழுக் காயும்,
வைகறைக் கமையக் கைபுனைந் தியற்றிய
வின்றேனளைஇய விளம்பசுங் காயும்
பைந்தளி ரடுக்கும் பலமுத லாகிய
மன்பெரு வாசமொடு நன்பல வடக்கிய
பயில்வினை யடைப்பையொடு படியகந் திருத்தி " (—3-14 81-83)

In the above lines it is clearly mentioned that the areca-nut soaked in the red jam of black ebony is to be used for the midday betel-chewing, and the ripe-red areca-nut for the evening time and the tender honey areca-nut for the morning respectively. If these lines are considered in juxtaposition with the above stanza of *Jīvaka-cintāmaṇi*, the purpose of the mention of three different sorts of areca-nuts there will be evident to any reader viz that they were intended specifically for use in the three different parts of the day. Unfortunately the distinguished editor of these two classical works had not pointed out this important aspect in the use of areca-nuts in any of the explanatory glosses appended to both the works.

The standard Tamil medical treatise speaks of the manifold benefits accruing from the use of the different betel-leaves and the different proportions of using the areca-nuts etc., to suit the periods of the day and of the manner of using the leaves themselves in several stanzas thus :—

ஐயம் அறுங்கா ணதன்சாரங் கொண்டக்காற்
பையச் சயித்தியம்போம் பைந்தொடியே—மெய்யின்
கடியின் குணம்போகுங் காரவெற்றிலைக்குப்
படியுமுத் தோடமிதைப் பார்.

எட்டிலொன்று கிட்டினீ ரேற்றஞ் சிரோபார
மாட்டி விடுசந்நி மாந்தமொடு—நாட்டிற்
பரியகுரற் கம்மல்வலி பண்டியுப்பி சம்போ
மரியகம் மாறுவெற்றிலை.

காலை பிளவதிகங் கட்டுச்சி நீறதிகம்
மாலை யிலையதிக மாயருந்தில்—வேல்விழியே
காலை மலங்கழியுங் கட்டுச்சி தீபனமாம்
மாலை மணங்குலவும் வாய்.

வாயுமந்தம் பீநசஞ்சு வாசகா சம்மருசி
யேயுதர தோட மிவைபோக்குந்—தூயுடற்குக்
காந்திதரும் புத்திக்குங் கட்குநலஞ் செய்யுமணஞ்
சார்ந்தநறுந் தம்பலர சம்.

While the stanzas one, two and four refer to the remedies arising from the different sorts of betel leaves and betel-juice, the third stanza points out that in the morning areca-nut must be used in larger proportion than the other two which will help easy evacuation of bowels, that in the midday the lime should similarly be used, to help quick digestion and that in the evening the betel leaves should be used in like manner, to give out sweet breath from the mouth.

Thus from the foregoing literary references in Tamil, works ranging from the early centuries of the Christian era up to the 10th century A. D. we find that the Tamilians have developed the art of the cosmetics from very early times though separate treatises embodying its tenets are not known to exist at the present day. The metrical Tamil lexicons surprisingly make only a scanty mention of certain constituents of these varieties of cosmetics though widely known through other literature. The absence of any literature on this art at the present day may be accounted for by the ravages of time and political vicissitudes that the Tamil land had passed through in the course of long centuries.

POSTSCRIPT. — The subject is an absorbing one and, so far as we are aware, has not been treated of before by any scholar. We are indebted to the author for taking up the subject and are sure that a thorough discussion of it from both points of view — Dravidian and Aryan — will yield interesting results. If the Tamilians have

developed the art of cosmetics from very early times, the Aryans had developed it from still earlier times. Cosmetics is counted as one of the sixty-four arts developed by the Indians and the subject is dealt with also by the way in the *Kāmasūtra* which lays down rules for the conduct of a *nāgarika* or refined person. Certain references by the classical Sanskrit poets to a few aspects of cosmetics are given below which, together with those quoted by the author of the article from Tamil classics, bear ample testimony to the high level attained by our countrymen in the art.

It is mentioned in the *Rāmāyaṇa* that Anasūyā presented Sītā an *aṅgarāga* (a scented cosmetic) in addition to flowers, ornaments and clothes. Vālmīki calls the *aṅgarāga* a *mahārham anulepanam*. So Anasūyā must have known the art of preparing a highly scented and very valued cosmetic preparation which makes the body bright and prevents the complexion from fading. (Ayodhya. 118, 18–19). This shows that the cosmetic art was prevalent and was practised in India long before the beginning of the Christian Era. The references in the *Kāmasūtra* point to the same conclusion.

Kālidāsa frequently refers to the practice of applying collyrium to the eyes by the damsels. In describing the decoration of Pārvatī for her marriage with Śiva, he says that it was applied to her eyes more as a mark of auspiciousness than as a means of beautifying her eyes, thus showing that other ladies used it as an ornament to the eyes (*Kumāra.* 7, 20). In another stanza which is found in both the *Raghuvaṁśa* and the *Kumārasambhava*, Kālidāsa tells us that the collyrium is applied to the eyes by the ladies with a thin rod or stick (*Raghu.* 7, 8 = *Kumāra.* 7, 59).

The practice of besmearing the body with sandal paste and ornamenting it with designs drawn in saffron is also referred to by Kālidāsa in connection with the decoration of Pārvatī (*Kumāra.* 7, 15).

The practice of colouring the feet with *alaktakam* is very frequently described by the Sanskrit poets from very early times. Kālidāsa says that Pārvatī's feet were usually coloured with red lac and they were specially coloured so at the time of her decoration for marriage (*Kumāra.* 5, 68 and 7, 19). In his drama *Mālavikāgnimitra*, Mālavikā's feet are said to be coloured with red lac for kicking the Aśoka tree to make it blossom. Another stanza which is common to both the *Raghuvaṁśa* and the *Kumārasambhava* indicates that all fashionable ladies dyed their feet with red lac to make them appear more attractive (*Kumāra.* 7, 58 = *Raghu.* 7, 7). Not only the feet but also the lips (especially the lower lip) are said to be dyed in a

similar manner in the *kāvyas*. Pārvatī's lip is described as being painted with red lac (*Kumāra*. 7, 18). Vātsyāyana refers to the practice thus: दत्त्वा सिक्थकमलक्तकं च । The commentator Jayamaṅgala describes the process in detail as follows.

ईषदार्द्रयालक्तकपिण्डया घृष्टौष्ठं ताम्बूलमुपयुज्य सिक्थकगुटिकया ताडयेदित्यर्थक्रमः ।

With regard to bathing in scented water, we have ample references to it in Sanskrit *kāvyas*. Bāṇa says that King Śūdraka was taking bath कुङ्कुमजलेन and चन्दनरसमिश्रेण सलिलेन and that Śūdraka's bath-room was filled अतिसुरभिगन्धसलिलपूर्णैः परिमलावकृष्टमधुकरकुलान्धकारितमुखैः कलशैः and was गन्धोदकपूर्णकनकमयजलद्रोणीसनाथमध्या, although he did not enumerate the different ingredients.

But in another class of literature (called the Agamas) which deals with temples and temple worship, the names of flowers, herbs, barks and seeds to be used for perfuming, and perhaps medicating, the water to be used in bathing are enumerated and we may infer that it got the information from the Cosmetic art. The water is of different kinds as *gandhodaka*, *akṣatodaka*, *phalodaka*, *ratnodaka* *sarvauṣadhyudaka* etc. and they are defined as follows:

जलपिष्टचन्दनादिगन्धद्रव्ययुतं गन्धोदकम् ।
माषयवसर्षपव्रीहितण्डुलैर्युक्तं जलमक्षतोदकम् ।
कदलीपूगपनसनालिकेरमातुलिंगाद्यैः फलैर्यथालाभैर्युक्तं फलोदकम् ।
नवरत्नैः पञ्चरत्नैर्वा (अलाभे सुवर्णेन वा) संयुक्तं रत्नोदकम् ।
सर्वैस्त्रिभिरधिकैर्वा संयुक्तं सर्वौषध्युदकम् ॥

The fragrant substances are enumerated as follows:

हरेणुस्थौणेयकपत्रागरुश्यामाककचोरचैरुवालमांसिचन्दनैलालवङ्गकर्पूरोशीरस्थिरानारद-
सावनकुस्तुरूणां चूर्णम् ।

Powders of some barks and roots are also referred to:

अश्वत्थवटमधूकखदिरवञ्जुलासनानां त्वक्चूर्णकषायम् ।
पत्काशापामार्गभूर्जपत्रनन्द्यावर्तकरवीरपद्मकुशपत्राणां मूलगन्धान् ।

Bāṇa also refers to the practice of besmearing the body with scented sandal paste thus:

मृगमदकर्पूरकुङ्कुमवाससुरभिणा चन्दनेनानुलिप्तसर्वाङ्गः । गोरोचनाच्छुरितदेहः ।

The chewing of betel-leaves along with nuts and other spices is regularly practised by the Indians after meals. It finds a place in the daily routine of King Śūdraka as described by Bāṇa in his *Kādambarī*:

परिपीतधूपवर्तिः गृहीतताम्बूलः तस्मात्प्रदेशादुत्थाय ।

The *Kāmasūtra* also includes it in the daily practices of a fashionable person in the morning as follows:

स प्रातरुत्थाय कृतनियतकृत्यः गृहीतदन्तधावनः मात्रयानुलेपनं धूपं स्रजमिति च गृहीत्वा दत्त्वा सिक्थकमलक्तकं च दृष्ट्वादर्शे मुखम्, गृहीतमुखवासताम्बूलः कार्याण्यनुतिष्ठेत् ॥

The presence of the *tāmbūla-karaṅka-vāhinī* at the courts of Kings and in the household of the rich points to the regular practice of betel-chewing. Betel-leaves, nuts etc. are even now presented to distinguished visitors as a mark of respect by the Indians.

P. V. RAMANUJASVAMI

ŚRĪ RĀMA, THE KING AND ŚAMBŪKA, THE ŚŪDRA-SAINT.

(A Psychological and Ethical Scrutiny.)

By N. Subrahmanya Sastri, M. A.

रे हस्त दक्षिण मृतस्य शिशोर्द्विजस्य जीवातवे विसृज शूद्रमुनौ कृपाणम् ।
रामस्य गात्रमसि दुर्वहगर्भखिन्नसीताविवासनपटोः करुणा कुतस्ते ॥

[O my right arm; dash the sword at the Sūdra-saint, in order that the dead child of the Brāhman may be restored to life. You are a part of the body of Rāma who is capable of banishing Sītā, though she was advanced in pregnancy. Whence could there be compassion in you.]

There are moments even in the lives of individuals that are unknown to power and fame, when the mind is inextricably caught in the horns of a moral or religious dilemma. No difficulty, however, presents itself to the persons, whose principles change with the changing hour, and to whom the dictates of conscience, the laws of duty and righteousness are and have been, always, a dead letter. Only those whose ideals are pure and sublime and whose aspirations point heavenward are in a position to feel the pangs inflicted by many a thorn in the pathway of a well-regulated and godly life.

The verse quoted at the beginning of this article is one of the finest combinations of poetry and art which is also rich in psychological and moral ideas, that can be selected from the dramas of Bhavabhūti. We should transport ourselves to that period of Rāma's career when fresh from the conquest of Rāvaṇa he was ruling over the kingdom of Kosala as the king. Rāma was an ideal king of old, who had his own notions of a model government, being, as he was utterly ignorant of the latest politics of the twentieth century. He hit upon a plan of sending out spies into the very midst of his subjects. He learnt through them the remarks, if any, passed from time to time on his conduct both as sovereign and as citizen by every class of his people. Praises real or formal, of his actions and of his valour, were of no avail to him. To one who occupies the first rank among men, praises from all quarters are a matter of daily occurrence and must needs pass away very soon into meaningless flattery. Rāma was not lured by any such childish foolery. He wanted to know his defects, wherein he fell short of the standard to which kings are expected to conform, and what were the remidies suggested as to how best the evil may be removed or counteracted. One day,— the

unhappiest day in his life, perhaps, — one of his spies came to him with the news that the people expressed grave doubts as to Sītā's chastity while in Rāvaṇa's house and as to the advisability of retaining her in the royal palace. Sītā, of no human origin, the darling daughter of mother earth, the foster-child of the foremost of royal sages, Janaka, was now the object of censure at the hands of the ignorant mob although her chastity was tested and found to be in tact by the god of Fire himself. Was he to banish his long lost partner in life but recently restored to him by fortune? Or was he to pass by, with disdain, the unpleasant opinions that his subjects thought fit to publish? It was only a minute ago that Sītā went to sleep, after having wrung out from him a promise that he will revisit with her the forest of Daṇḍaka where their happy life in exile was unexpectedly broken off by the carefully planned stratagem of Rāvaṇa. Here was a hard nut to crack. He thought, he wept, and finally he came to a conclusion, in consequence of which Lakṣmaṇa was ordered to take her to the forest and leave her there to herself. This was done. But poor Sītā knew not why Rāma did not carry out his promise to accompany her, nor even that she was banished, nor even the reason why such a treatment should be meted out to her. Rāma's conduct in this matter stands in need of no justification, for, none but the inconsiderate would think of blaming him for adopting such a course. He knew, far better than any of us, the relative importance of family affection and kingly duty. Though an absolute monarch, he was the respector of public voice and all considerations that were purely personal had to be forgotten when the imperial voice of duty called him forth to action. What other duty a kṣatriya has to discharge than to protect and please his subjects by all that lies in his power and to see that they are happy in every way? Let us not, therefore, mistake Rāma to be a hard-hearted husband, cruel even to his lawfully wedded wife.

For a short time after this sad event, everything went on smoothly till there was cause for another friction. This time it was the premature death of a Brāhmin infant. The dead body of the child was laid at the palace door, and Rāma's misgovernment was adduced as the reason for such abnormal occurrences. Rāma was again in a fix. He was confronted with a vague accusation whose particulars he could not ascertain. He was not conscious, to the very best of his recollection, of a single instance of voluntary misrule on his own part. If people are superstitious now, they were still more so in those olden days and he too believed with others that

failure of rain, frequence of pestilence, famine, and premature death could result only from the misbehaviour of the king in the management of the state.[1] A voice in the air gave him the required clue.[2] It declared that a Śūdra whose name was Śambūka was practising penance with as much sincerity and zeal as any Brahmin was ever capable of, and that the dead child would come back to life if that Sūdra-saint was found out and slain. In this case, however, Rāma was scarcely at a loss as to what he ought to do. He left his palace without any delay, with sword drawn, in search of Sambūka. And the irony of fate was such that Rāma did not find him out until he came to the very forest of Daṇdak, joint visit to which was the subject of that last unfulfilled wish of Sīta. But Rāma knew not at first sight that he was in that forest. He was now face to face with the śūdra-saint, ready to fling his sword at him. The poet gives us a glimpse into the complexity of feelings and emotions that, at that critical instant, bewildered the mind of that half-human, half-divine Being. Rāma addresses his right hand and commands it to deal the fatal blow. But why should it? Because the Brahmin infant should be restored to life. But pity melts his heart, a stronger pity than that which overpowered Arjuna at the sight of his relations, dear and near, on the battle-field of Kurukṣetra. Moreover, there was no Śrī Kṛṣṇa here to rouse him to do his duty. But Rāma was the Lord Himself and He was his own teacher and guide. The human had to

1. रामस्य दुष्कृतं किंचिन्महदस्ति न संशयः। यथा हि विषयस्थानां बालानां मृत्युरागतः ॥
राजदोषैर्विपद्यन्ते प्रजा ह्यविधिपालिताः। असद्वृत्ते तु नृपतावकाले म्रियते जनः ॥

Rāmāyan Uttara kāṇḍā Ch. 73; 10, 16.

सुव्यक्तं राजदोषो हि भविष्यति न संशयः। पुरे जनपदे चापि ततो बालवधो ह्ययम् ॥

Rāmāyan Uttara kāṇḍa Ch. 73.

2. There is no reference to this 'voice in the air' in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, where it is Nārada who meeting the King along with other Ṛṣis tells Rāma about the cause of the infant's death. In order to restore the dead child to life, Rāma was advised by the sage Nārada to punish the Sūdra, who had transgressed the rules of society and overstepped his rights by practising austerities within the limits of his dominions. (Rā. Uttarakāṇḍa Ch. 74.)

For the change of device from the advice of Nārada into a voice in the air, Bhavabhūti is not responsible. He hss followed in the foot-steps of the immortal poet Kālidāsa, whom he set up before him as a worthy ideal to be approached. Kālidāsa in his *Raghuvamśa* makes mention of the voice cf. "उच्चचार पुरस्तस्य गूढरूपा सरस्वती" Raghuvamśa. Canto XV, sloka 46.

"The Goddess of speach, keeping herself concealed, uttered in front of him." as follows.

राजन् प्रजासु ते कश्चिदपचारः प्रवर्तते। तमन्विष्य प्रशमयेर्भवितासि ततः कृती ॥

Raghu. XV. 47.

be merged in the divine, the purely personal, in the universal good, and Rāma, the tender-hearted, had to become the hard-hearted slayer of an innocent victim in the discharge of the stern duty incumbant on his ksatriya caste. Why should compassion stop his right hand from fulfilling its mission now, though it was unable to do so when the self-same hand signed the order of banishment of his beloved wife inspite of the advanced state of pregnancy? This bold thought gave him the necessary strength and inspiration, and the bloody deed was done. The śūdra-saint suffered, however, no harm from it, but, on the other hand, received the benefit of freedom from a long endured curse, and in his heavenly form now acquired, extolled Rāma as his divine benefactor. The Brahmin child too opened its eyes and became, once more, the pride and joy of its parents.

But why should Rāma kill a saint? Is not a Śūdra as much entitled to final release as any of the twice-born classes? Rapid progress in the evolution of the soul must be appreciated and rewarded, and not punished or impeded. It is true. But religion and society were not antagonistic to each other in those times. People did not then dream of a universal religion irrespective of the nationality, the caste, the family and the hundred other circumstances that surrounded the life on earth of each individual. The stability of society was thought to depend on a proper division of labour. None strove to occupy a place to which the rules of society did not permit him. It was not that the twice-born was different in the least from the Śūdra in the eye of God. For God was in every phase of social life and not confined, like the 'Christian God' to men of a particular faith. Religious principles might very well adorn the nature of the humblest menial, though they might be missed in the luxury of a kingly career. Even a petty trader, for instance, may be honest in his profession and useful to the society at large and count for a saint before the God. Whereas the so-called twice-born, muttering prayers with his mind full of the world, deserves no better fate than being condemned by God and by his own consciousness as a downright impostor. What is a Kṣatriya for, if not to protect his subjects against their enemies? Otherwise he would be indirectly oppressing his own people by not properly exercising his power against their oppressors. It may be remembered that when Arjuna preferred the life of a mendicant to the slaughter of his elders and preceptors assembled in battle arry (Gita II, 5), Lord Kṛṣṇa exerted his utmost to dissuade him from any such tendency. He also exclaims later on (Gīta, III, 35), that ill-luck in the carrying out of one's ordained duty is far better than success in domain of a different profession in life. For, ignorant and unaccustomed, one will have to stumble on dangers and obstacles at every step.

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOUBLE DATES ĀṆḌU AND EDIR-ĀṆḌU IN THE REGNAL YEARS OF CERTAIN CHŌḶA, PĀṆḌYA AND OTHER KINGS

BY

S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRY, B.A.,

(Late Devasthanam Archæologist, Tirupati; Author of the Tirupati Devasthanam Epigraphical Report and Editor and Translator of the T. D. Inscriptions.)

(*continued from Vol. VI Part 1*)

An inscription[1] from Vēdāraṇyam in the Tanjore district, dated in the 29+1st year of the reign of Rājarāja III, mentions "an invasion of the Tamil country by Siṅgaṇṇa Daṇḍanāyaka" in the 25th year of Rājarāja's reign. But no clue is given either as to the identity[2] of this Daṇḍanāyaka or as to the object of the invasion in the face of the military occupation of the Chōḷa kingdom by Hoysaḷa Vira Sōmēśvara with his permanent capital[3] at Kaṇṇanūr near Śrīraṅgam and the camps of his officers at different centres.[4] However, the calamity that overtook Rājarāja at this period as indicated by the invasion of Siṅgaṇṇa is found reflected in his inscriptions by the manner of dating them in the double *āṇḍu* as the 24+1st year,[5] 24+1+1st year[6] and 25+1st year[7] to denote the 25th and 26th years of his reign. Apparently this was the time when Kōpperuñjiṅga was making strenuous efforts to gain independence from the Chōḷa yoke and actually declared his independence in A. D. 1243, by dating his inscriptions in his own regnal years from this year[8] onwards, ostensibly supported by the Pāṇḍya ruler Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II

1. No. 501 of 1904; Mad. Ep. Rep. 1905, Para 20.
2. Dr. S. K. Aiyangar, South India And Her Mhdn. Invaders, page 47, identifies him with the Hoysaḷa general Siṅgaṇṇa Daṇḍanāyaka who was defeated by Jat. Sundara Pāṇḍya I and given over to an elephant.
3. Mad. Ep. Rep. 1899—1900, page 10, Para 30.
4. At Kāñchī, Polāḷvi Daṇḍānāyāka (369 of 1919), Daṇḍinagōpa Mādaya, the Mahāpradhāni (616, 617 of 1919) both in the 20th year of Rājarāja III; at Tirumalavāḍi (Trichi. Dt.) Vallaya Daṇḍanāyaka (39 of 1920) in 20th year; at Kāñchi, again Vallaya Daṇḍanāyaka in 22nd year (366 of 1919); Mallaya Daṇḍanāyaka (611 of 1919), his brother Kēśava Daṇḍanāyaka (612 of 1919) and another brother Goppaya Daṇḍanāyaka (615 of 1919) — all in 24th year; at Karuvūr (Coimbatore dt.), Daṇḍinagōpa Sōmaiya Daṇḍanāyaka (138 of 1905) in 24th year; at Tirugōkarṇam (Puduk.), some servants of Somaladēvī in 20th year (Pd. 183).
5. 532 of 1904 and 199 of 1927.
6. 371 of 1907.
7. 75 of 1922.
8. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., P. 144.

who succeeded[1] Māravarman Sundara I about A.D. 1239, though no direct evidence is available for such support. Consequently the catastrophies that overtook Rājarāja through the loss of his crown and throne and the resulting interregnums during the 25th and 26th years must be traced to the revolt of the Kāḍava Kōpperuñjiṅga, actively supported by the Pāṇḍyas during the 24th year of Rājarāja's reign corresponding to A.D. 1240-41, culminating in the assumption of independence by the Kāḍava in A.D. 1243 which is about the 26th year of Rājarāja. Hence, in spite of the presence of other Hoysaḷa generals in the South at this time, the invasion by Siṅgaṇṇa Daṇḍanāyaka must be deemed to have been called for to quell the revolt of Kōpperuñjiṅga, punish the Pāṇḍyā and restore the Chōḷa to his throne again.

One more double date comes to notice from an inscription[2] of Rājarāja at Udaiyalūr in the Tanjore district, viz. 5+1st year. This is the earliest among the double dates of Rājarāja so far noticed and signifies the earliest break in his reign during his 5th—6th year. This must be the result of an invasion of the Chōḷa country by Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I in alliance with Kōpperuñjiṅga and the Magara chief. For we find the epigraphs of Māravarman Sundara,[3] dated from his 3rd year onwards, claiming the conquest of the Chōḷa country and its presentation, and among the places from which these records come are Gaṅgaikoṇḍachōḷapuram in the Trichinopolly district and Kuḍimiyāmalai in the Pudukkota State which formed part of the Chōḷa dominions. All the same we get numerous inscriptions of Rājarāja from the Trichinopolly district dated during his early years and one from Nārtāmalai[4] in the Pudukkota State dated in the 3rd year and one more in the 7th year, so that it may be inferred that only a small portion of the Chōḷa territory in the Pudukkota State had been occupied, if at all, by the Pāṇḍya to justify his claim to the conquest of the Chōḷa kingdom within the first few years of his reign. Further, the Kāḍava Kōpperuñjiṅga is reported, in an inscription[5] at

1. Mad. Ep. Rep. 1910, Para 33.
2. 308 of 1927.
3. 77 of 1892, Gaṅgaikoṇḍachōḷapuram (Trichi. dt.), 2nd year of Kōnērinmaikoṇḍān Sundara Pāṇḍya ; 362 of 1906, Kuḍimiyāmalai (Puduk), 3rd year, with title 'who was pleased to take the Chōḷa country' ; 322 of 1927-28, Tiruppālaikkuḍi (Ramnad), 3rd year, 'who was pleased to present the Chōḷa country'; 122 of 1910, Teṅkarai (Madura), 4th year, 'who was pleased to take the Chōḷa country' ; 100 of 1907, Kallaḍaikurichchi (Tinnev. dt), 5th year, 'who was pleased to take the Chōḷa country' : 317 of 1927-28, Mēlachcheluvanūr (Ramnad). 5th year, 'who presented the Chōḷa country.'
4. 358 of 1904 of 3rd year ; 357 of 1904 of 7th year.
5. 271 of 1904 ; *ante.* page 10.

Yōgi-Mallavaram near Tirupati of the 6th year of Rājarāja, to have fought a battle at Uratti (Oratti in the Chingleput district) with Vīra Nārasiṅgadēva Yādavārāya, a prominent provincial ruler in this part of the country under Rājarāja III, in which one Nārāyaṇappiḷḷai, a subordinate of the Yādavarāya, lost his life, for whom certain memorial services were instituted in the temple by the Yādavarāya. This battle at Uratti must have been fought in the 5th – 6th year of Rājarāja, sometime prior to the date of the inscription in the 6th year, and the Kāḍava Kōpperuñjiṅga must have allied himself from the first with the Pāṇḍya as also with his neighbour the Bāṇa chief of the Magara tract, and determined to subvert the Chōḷa authority which he could not attempt single-handed. In further evidence of this menace to Chōḷa rule, we have the "agreements[1] among three chieftains of mutual friendship for offence and defence and common fealty to the king" recorded at Tanjore in the 3rd year of Rājarāja's reign, apparently with a view to avert the impending danger from different sides and to uphold the Chōḷa power, as well as the pledges[2] of two persons 'never to leave the service of Piḷḷaiyār Pirudi-Gaṅgar' with an identical object.

As regards the political conditions prevailing in the Chōḷa kingdom at this period, and particularly during the 5th year of Rājarāja's reign, some side-light is thrown by a few inscriptions pertaining to Rājarāja himself. No. 141 of 1926 from Tiruviḷakkuḍi in the Tanjore district, dated in his 16+1st year refers to 'the troubles of the 5th year of the reign', when certain images of the temple were removed for safe custody and 'deposited in the temple of Tiru-chchattimuṟṟam by the followers of Vāṇakōvaraiyar.' Likewise No. 228 of 1929 from Tiruvaḍatturai in the South Arcot district, dated in the 10th year of Rājarāja, relates that 'the Hoysaḷa king Narasimhadēva destroyed the country and the temples, and took away the (images of) gods.' Again No 213 of 1925 from Talaich-chaṅgādu (Tanjore district) reports that 'the old *pottagam* and *oḷugu uḷḷiṭṭa kōśam* (revenue records of the village) had been lost in the disturbed state of the country (*duritaṅgaḷ*) in the 5th, 16th (6th ?) and 15th years of the king'. Another Udaiyalūr epigraph, No. 309 of 1927, without any date, 'mentions the loss of title deeds in a commotion (*kshōbham*) in the 5th year of the king'. These records[3]

1. 23 of 1897.
2. 496 of 1902.
3. I am much obliged for these and other references to 'The Chōḷas' by Prof. Nilakanta Sastri, particularly to the Lists of Inscriptions in the Appendix to Vols. I and II.

show that the Chōḷa country, particularly the Tanjore and South Arcot districts, was in a state of turmoil, which cannot be considered to have been due to any aggressive invasion and wanton ravages caused by the Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha, for we know that he came to the rescue of Chōḷa king on two later occasions, i e , during the 7th and the 16th years ; and on this occasion also the purpose must be the rescue of Rājarāja who was hemmed in by his enemies on all sides,—by the Kāḍava and the Magara chiefs on the north and the west, and by the Pāṇḍya on the south Further, the military manoeuvres of Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha during the 6th—7th year[1] cannot be taken to be separate and detached items of warfare, but they must have formed continuous campaigns beginning in the 5th year[2] of Rājarāja's reign as mentioned in the epigraphs noticed above and apparently closing temporarily during the 7th year; for there was actually no cessation of these disturbances and commotions at any time for any sufficiently long period during Rājarāja's reign, since the single regnal years, i.e., the years indicated by the single figures, intervening between the double *āṇḍu* dates must have only been periods of preparation, march and attack by the combined forces of the Pāṇḍya king, and the Kāḍava and the Magara chiefs on the one hand, and the counter-marches and attacks and repulses by the Chōḷa and the Hoysaḷa armies on the other.

It becomes, therefore, evident that Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I set his mind upon the subversion of the Chōḷa empire, as did Peruñjiṅga, and the expansion of the Pāṇḍya kingdom and power and accordingly delivered his first attack on the southern-most part of the Chōḷa territories in the Trichinopolly district and the Pudukkota State and occupied a portion thereof during his 2nd and 3rd years, in evidence of which an inscription of the 2nd year of Kōnērinmaikoṇḍa Sundara Pāṇḍya exists at Gaṅgaikoṇḍachōḷapuram[3] (Trichinopolly district) and one of the 3rd year at Kuḍimiyāmalai[4] in the Pudukkota State. But it would appear that his first attempts at expansion failed miserably and he suffered defeat and loss of crown and throne, as indicated by an inscription at Mānūr[5] in the Tinnevelly district dated in the 2+1st year of Tribhuvanachakravartin Kōnērinmaikoṇḍān, since in certain inscriptions of his he assumes the *biruda*

1. *Ante.* page 7.
2. Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha II, son of Ballāḷa II, was crowned in April 1220 (Sewell Histl. Inspns, p. 135). These campaigns came soon thereafter.
3. 77 of 1892.
4. 362 of 1906.
5. 424 of 1906.

Kōnērinmaikoṇḍān. This initial success of Māravarman Sundara did not go unchallenged. For we find the subsequent years of his reign indicated by the double *āṇḍu*, as 3+1st year[1] for the 4th year, 4+1+1st year[2], 4+2nd year[3] and 5+1st year[4] for the 6th year, and 4+3rd year[5] for the 7th regnal year. Consequently we gather that in all these early years of Sundara Pāṇḍya's reign since his accession to the throne in the middle of 1216 A.D. he was engaged in a prolonged war with the Chōḷa, in the course of which success alternated with reverses for both the rulers and they were forced to forego their throne and crown for a time on each occasion of severe defeat for either of them until they recovered them once again. And in these internicine wars in the earlier years, Rājarāja would appear to have maintained himself fairly successfully, depending mainly upon his own strength, as against the onslaughts of the Pāṇḍya and the Kāḍava, and to have repulsed their attacks and even to have inflicted defeats on them, until the catastrophe of an overthrow came upon him, for the first time as far as is known, in his 5+1st year, while Māravarman Sundara was unseated again and again almost continuously till his 7th year and even thereafter, and was consequently the worse sufferer. Hence we may conclude that the presence of Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha[6] in the Chōḷa country during the 5th year of the reign of Rājarāja, when he is stated in the inscriptions to have wrought some destruction and caused damage to temples and village records, was in relief of Rājarāja in his impending crisis as against the concerted aggressive attacks of Sundara Pāṇḍya, Kōpperuñjiṅga and the Magara chief, and accordingly the destruction and damage were intended to deprive the enemy of all quarter and support from their occupied territory—the policy of the scorched earth. And in these early wars Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha must have gained final victory over the enemy during the 6th—7th year of Rājarāja, after defeating the Magara chief and marching against Śrīraṅgam in 1222 A.D. and then restored Rājarāja to his throne. This restoration of the Chōḷa king is posed in the inscriptions[7] of Sundara Pāṇḍya as a gracious act voluntarily done by him on supplication by Rājarāja together with

1. 306 of 1927-28.
2. 96 and 678 of 1905.
3. 95 of 1905.
4. 122 of 1903; 93,102 of 1907; 300 of 1928.
5. 679 of 1905.
6. *Ante.* pages 15-16.
7. Tirupparaṅkunram and Tirukkōḷūr inspns., pages 4—5 *ante.*

his son at Chidambaram, without the mention of any outside agency as that of Hoysaḷa Vīra Narsiṁha.

According to the indication given by the Tirupparankunram and Tirukkōḷūr inscriptions, these events ending with the restitution of the Chōḷa king in the 7th year, i.e., A.D. 1222-23, may be taken to comprise the first phase of the life-long war between Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I and Rājarāja III; and it is in this first phase that Sundara Pāṇḍya, in alliance with Kōpperuñjiṅga and the Magara chief, 'spread round his army of angry steeds and elephants, and gave over to red-fire the cities of Tanjore (Tañjai) and Uraiyūr (Urandai),' anointed himself as a victor in 'the coronation hall of thousand pillars' of the Chōḷas and presented the Chōḷa kingdom to his minstrels or other favourites, before its recovery by Rājarāja through the intervention of Hoysaḷa Vīra Narasiṁha II in 1222–23 A.D. A Tanjore epigraph[1] of Māravarman Sundara, the date of which falls on 13th March, 1223, corroborates his occupation of the southern portion of the Chōḷa kingdom up to Tanjore and thereabout. All the same, Rājarāja's inscriptions also exist in the Trichinopolly and Tanjore districts, dated in the previous and subsequent months[2], viz., 20th February and 15th April, 1223, which may go to show that Sundara Pāṇḍya was dislodged from his occupied station and the country was re-occupied by the Chōḷa king. One prominent event of this first phase, viz., Sundara Pāṇḍya's stay at Chidambaram and his worship of Naṭarāja before the prostration and supplication of Rājarāja with his son and the restitution of the Chōḷa kingdom to him with libations of water and the conferment of the title of 'Chōḷapati', has not been corroborated so far by any inscriptions of his at Chidambaram. The probability, therefore, is that it was not Chidambaram that Sundara Pāṇḍya visited soon after his anointment at Muḍikoṇḍaśōḷapuram but some other religious centre in or near Pudukkota.

The second phase of the life-long war waged by Sundara Pāṇḍya against Rājarāja may be taken to fall between the 7th year of Rājarāja following close upon his first restoration and the 16th year when he was liberated from his imprisonment at Śēndamaṅgalam by the two Hoysaḷa generals so as to occupy his throne again. During this period Sundara Pāṇḍya had not only the renewed support of his old allies, the Kāḍava Kōpperuñjiṅga and the Bāṇa chief of the Magadai-

1. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., P. 137; 52 of 1897, Tirukkāṭṭupaḷḷi, Tanjore dt., year 7.
2. *Ibid.* P. 137.

nāḍu or the Magara kingdom but had also secured a strong contingent from the king of Ceylon. It was, therefore, a very critical period in the life of Rājarāja who had to fight hard against the combined forces of the Pāṇḍyas and the Singalese in the south and those of the Kāḍava and the Magara chief on the north and west, and in spite of the support from Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha, suffer a severe defeat in the ferocious and sanguinary battles that followed. From the account of this war given in the *Gadyakarṇāmrita*[1] that Rājarāja fled to his ally after his defeat[2] at the hands of the Pāṇḍya and that he was then during his flight overtaken by Kōpperuñjiṅga, it is clear that the Chōḷa and the Hoysaḷa armies had not joined in an action against the Pāṇḍya but were engaged separately at different places. The existence of Sundara Pāṇḍya's inscriptions at Tirukkāṭṭupaḷḷi[3] (Tanjore dt.) of the 7th year, at Śūlamaṅgalam[4] (Tanjore dt.) of the 8+1st year, at Śrīraṅgam[5] (Trichi. dt.) of the 9th year, in the South Arcot district[6] in the 10th year, in the Pudukkota State[6] in the 10th and 11th years, at Conjeevaram[6] remitting taxes in the 12th year on the 13th October 1227 and again in Pudukkota[6] in the 13th year in 1229 A.D. show that Sundara Pāṇḍya had, within half a dozen years, penetrated from his home districts of Madura and Tinnevelly through the Trichinopolly and Tanjore districts into the northern portion of the Chōḷa territories as far as Conjeevaram in the Chingleput district, passing beyond his ally the Kāḍava's chiefship of Śēndamaṅgalam in the South Arcot district. Notwithstanding his audacious dash at the start, he was not allowed any respite in these parts, as we must infer their re-occupation by Rājarāja by the existence of his inscriptions at Mannārguḍi[6] (Tanjore dt.) on 17-8-1225, at Uḍaiyārpāḷaiyam[6] (Trichi. dt.) on 24-10-1225 and 27-12-1227, in Tanjore[6] on 30-11-1226 and on 7-10-1229, Tirutturaippūṇḍi[6] (Tanjore dt.) in May and August 1227, at Conjeevaram[6] in August and December 1227, in the 14th year on 25-8-1229 and again in his 15th year, in the Chingleput district[6] in July 1228, and at several

1. 'The Chōḷas,' Vol. II, P. 180, extract translated from "Tirumala Srī Vēṅkaṭēśvara," Part 9.

2. *Ibid.* Page 180, note 24, points out that 'a fragmentary inscription dated Ś. 1152, 419 of 1914, from Tiruchchuḻi (Rd.) mentions the defeat of Jananātha (who refused to make obeisance) by Sunda...' This is obviously a reference to the defeat of Rājarāja by Sundara Pāṇḍya in S. 1152, A.D. 1230-31, before Rājarāja's defeat again by Peruñjiṅga at Teḷḷāṛu in A.D. 1231-32.

3. 52 of 1897 records the building of the shrine of the goddess.

4. 561 of 1921.

5. 53 of 1892.

6. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., Pages 138 and 139.

places in the Tanjore, Salem and South Arcot districts[1] in February, May, July and August, 1230 A.D. Meanwhile Hoysaḷa Vīra Narasiṁha's son, Sōmēśvara, is said to have been residing at Kaṇṇanūr[2] in March 1228, while Vīra Narasiṁha himself was at Conjeevaram[2] in March 1229. And in 1230 Sōmēśvara[2] is stated to have been "connected with his father's exploits, in 'pursuing the Pāṇḍya king' and 'penetrating into the Chōḷa country'."

All the same it would appear that Sundara Pāṇḍya, while being pursued by Sōmēśvara, turned round, attacked the Chōḷa king, gave battle to him, defeated him and pursued him. At this stage when "defeated in battle by the Pāṇḍya ruler, King Rājarāja abandoned[3] his capital and together with his retinue (*saparivāram*) sought to reach the side of his ally, the ruler of Kuntala ; while on his way, he was overtaken by the Kāḍava king—who had a vanguard of forest troops and had grown strong by the accession of troops from foreign lands (*Mlēchchhadēśa*),—and together with his followers was taken captive after a fight. By this enemy......the King (Rājarāja) was dragged to his own city Jayantamaṅgala." The fight mentioned in this extract[3] must certainly refer to the battle of Teḷḷāṟu[4] mentioned in an undated inscription from Vāyalūr wherein Kōpperuñjiṅga is said to have defeated Rājarāja, imprisoned him together with his ministers and then occupied the Chōḷa country.[5] When 'this painful news' reached the Hoysaḷa king Vīra Narasiṁha, he "started (from his capital) in a few days, reached the northern bank of the Kāvērī and encamped in the neighbourhood of Śrīraṅgaṁ, and despatched his *daṇḍanātha* to punish all the enemy *sāmantas*, brought about the release of his friend, the Chōḷa king, and levied tribute from the Pāṇḍya",[6] after "the decisive encounter between the Pāṇḍya and Hoysaḷa troops took place at Mahēndramaṅgalam on the Kāvērī

1. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., pages 138 and 139.
2. *Ibid.* page 139.
3. Extract from 'Gadyakarṇāmṛita' in 'The Chōḷas,' Vol. II, P. 180. This gives further evidence of his loss of throne.
4. 'The Chōḷas,' Vol. II. P. 183. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., P. 136, places this battle in A.D. 1222, which is most unlikely, especially after Kōpperuñjiṅga's defeat at Uratti by the Chōḷa subordinate Vīra Nārasiṁha Yādavarāya in 1221 (*ante.* P. 10). Moreover there is no possibility of Rājarāja's imprisonment by Kōpperuñjiṅga after his alleged defeat at Teḷḷāṟu, in the face of Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha's campaigns aginst the Pāṇḍya and the Kāḍava. It is only Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I that claims to have dethroned Rājarāja III at this date about the 6th—7th regnal year.
5. This extension of the Kāḍava's territory far into the Tanjore dt. is confirmed by No. 536 of 1921 from Nīḍūr (Tanjore dt.) which states that this part of 'the country was formerly ruled by Kōpperuñjiṅga.'
6. 'The Chōḷas,' Vol. II, P. 180.

river,"[1] whereupon Sundara Pāṇḍya was subdued, almost simultaneously with the release of Rājarāja from his confinement at Śēndamaṅgalam.

These events relating to the imprisonment of Rājarāja at Śēndamaṅgalam and his release and restoration by the two Hoysaḷa generals are recorded in the Tiruvēndipuram inscription.[2] The Tirukkōḷūr inscription[3] of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I also recounts these deeds. But it attributes the cause of the war to Rājarāja's fool-hardy reliance on the strength of his own arms, his with-holding the tribute agreed to be paid by him to the Pāṇḍya as his suzerain for the restoration of his crown and kingdom to him on the previous occasion during his 7th year and his commencing an aggressive war against the Pāṇḍya and relates that in this war Sundara Pāṇḍya perpetrated a wholesale massacre of the Chōḷa forces, defeated the Chōḷa king, put him to flight, captured the enemy's retinue together with Rājarāja's chief queen, proceeded to Muḍikoṇḍaśōḷapuram and there "anointed himself hero, having placed pillars of victory in all directions." But there is no mention in it of Rājarāja's defeat at Teḷḷāṟu and imprisonment by Kōpperuñjiṅga and his release by Narasiṁha's generals, which took place in the 15th—16th year, although the Tirukkōḷūr inscription is dated in the 20th year of Sundara Pāṇḍya, corresponding to the 20th year of Rājarāja. Evidently these events did not concern the Pāṇḍya ruler. Certainly the *Vijayābhishēka* of Sundara Pāṇḍya at Muḍikoṇḍaśōḷapuram took place before his defeat at Mahēndramaṅgalam by Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha and also before the 15th year of his reign, 1230–31 A.D., and accordingly we find the earliest mention of it in a Pudukkota inscription of his 11th year[4] and in a Tiruvēḍagam (Madura dt.) inscription of his 14th year.[5] This is the third occasion[6] of Sundara Pāṇḍya's crowning, the first one possibly at Madura, the Pāṇḍya capital, in A.D. 1216, "while the destructive tiger and the evil—inflicting bow become alike in their decadence; while the fishes twain with lines of beauty play upon the

1. 'The Chōḷas,' Vol. II, P. 185.
2. *Ante*. P. 3.
3. *Ante*. P. 6.
4. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., P. 138, under A. D. 1227.
5. 682 of 1905. No mention is made, however, in the two Kuḍimiyāmalai inspns. 354 and 355 of 1906, of the same 14th year. 61 of 1905 of 15th year from Madura and 136 of 1903 of 15+1st year from Tiruvādavūr (Madura district) mention this anointment at Muḍikoṇḍaśōḷapuram. Hence Sewell's date of A.D. 1227 being 11th year seems doubtful.
6. All the 3 coronations are mentioned in the Tirukkōḷūr inscription.

brilliant gold mountain (Mēru); ...... while the garland, which Indra of the dazzling crown had put on his neck, shone over his breast; he had himself crowned in order that the path of Manu created by the cool-lotus-seated Brahma may prosper on earth"; for the second time in the 7th year of his reign "by celebrating the anointment of heroes in 'the coronation hall of thousand pillars', of the hostile Chōḷa," after "he fought against the angry Chōḷa till he lost his anger, and turned him into the desert for shelter," when "he assumed the (Chōḷa's) crown and made gifts to his minstrels"; and for the third time at Muḍikoṇḍaśōḷapuram before his 15th year; the two latter anointments being celebrated in two different Chōḷa capitals.

In this second phase of the internicine war, Sundara Pāṇḍya waxed strong in its early stages by reason of the accretion of the Siṅgalese army sent by the king of Ceylon in addition to the support given by Peruñjiṅga and the Magara chief, but latterly he was thoroughly vanquished by Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha in the battle of Mahēndramaṅgalam and compelled to submit himself to the Hoysaḷa and agree to pay tribute to him in his turn now, just as he is said to have claimed it from Rājarāja on his restitution in the 7th year. Not this one defeat at Mahēndramaṅgalam alone, but several such defeats Sundara Pāṇḍya must have suffered, for we find in the dates of his inscriptions more continuous breaks of longer duration of two and three years, as 8+1st year[1], 10+1st year[2], 11+1st year[3], 11+2nd year[4], 13+1st year[5], 13+3rd year[6], and 15+1st year[7]. Likewise the Kāḍava Kōpperuñjiṅga was dealt a severe blow by the two Hoysaḷa generals and overawed and forced to submission. However, these successes of Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha achieved in the cause of Rājarāja only served to gain a short respite to the Chōḷa but not avert the impending troubles in the succeeding third and the last phase of the war.

This second phase of the war called for the presence of both the Chōḷa feudatories and the Chōḷa supporters in and around Conjeevaram and their concentration thereat as evidenced by the existence of their inscriptions at this religious centre, which perhaps witnessed

1. 429 of 1906; 561 of 1921.
2. 388 of 1906.
3. 431 of 1906; 319 of 1928.
4. 120 of 1903; 275, 276, 285, 295 of 1928.
5. 305 of 1928.
6. 141 of 1902.
7. 142 of 1902; 136 of 1903.

the thick of the fight. The Telugu—Chōḍa Tikka Gaṇḍagōpāla was in the Chingleput district[1] in 1225, and in Conjeevaram[2] in 1230; in 1231 he claimed[2] to have 'taken Kāñchī'—apparently from Sundara Pāṇḍya[3] who held it in October 1227—and made a grant[4] of a village from Conjeevaram in 1233. Another Telugu-Chōḍa chief, Mahāmaṇḍalēśvara Vallūr-Mahārāja Rājadēva[5] made a gift of a lamp at Conjeevaram in the 14th year of Rājarāja, i.e., in 1230–31 A.D. Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha[6] was at Conjeevaram in March 1229. His general, the Daṇḍanāyaka Daṇḍinagōpa Jagadobbagaṇḍa Goppaya,[7] son of Malla Daṇḍanāyaka, made a gift of a village at Kāñchī in the 15th year of Rājarāja. Another general Bhūtadēvanāyaka[8] of Dōrasamudra was at Kāñchī in the 11th year of Rājarāja, 1226–27 A.D., when his daughter Bāchaladēvī made a gift of a lamp to the temple. In the 14th year, Ammaṇa Daṇḍanāyaka[9], a Mahā-Pradhāni of Hoysaḷa Vishṇuvardhana Vīra Narasiṅgadēva, was at Conjeevaram and presented cattle to the temple for a lamp. Also we find Narasiṁha's son Sōmēśvara[10] at Kaṇṇanūr in 1228; some servants[11] of Narasiṁha making gifts to temples in Pudukkota and at Śrīraṅgam in 1225 and 1233; a servant[12] of Sōmaladēvī, the queen of Vīra Narasiṁha and mother of Sōmēśvara, making a gift at Tirugōkarṇam in the Pudukkota State in the 10th year; a Chōḷa subordinate Nishadarājan[13] at Pon-Amarāvati (Puduk.) in the 8th year when he is stated to have built a *vimāna* and set up a *Śivaliṅga*; and Edirilisōḷa Śambuvarāyan *alias* Vīrasōḷan Attimallan[14] at Tiruvaṇṇāmalai (North Arcot) in the 14th year of Rājarāja. Again some of the inscriptions refer to certain incidents that happened during this second phase:—one at Talaichchangāḍa[15] (Tanjore district), of the 19th year, mentions that the revenue records of the village were 'lost in the disturbed stated of the country *(duritaṅgaḷ)* in the 5th, 16th (6th ?)

1. Sewell: Histl. Inspns. page 138.
2. *Ibid.* p. 140.
3. *Ibid.* p. 139. *Ante.* p. 19.
4. *Ibid.* p. 141.
5. 359 of 1919.
6. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., p. 139.
7. 404 of 1919.
8. 349 of 1919.
9. 408 of 1919.
10. Histl. Inspns., p. 139.
11. *Ibid.* pp. 140-141.
12. 410 of 1902.
13. 4 of 1909.
14. 551 of 1902.
15. 213 of 1925.

and 15th years of the king'; one at Tiruvalañjuḷi[1] (Tanjore district), of the 14th year, states that the village became depopulated in course of time and registers a gift by the village assembly for the welfare of the village, implying thereby that some danger threatened the village; and one at Ākkūr[2] (Tanjore district), of the 14th year and 278th day, recording a grant of land for the well-being of the king and the village, when certainly some danger was apprehended as regards the safety of both the Chōḷa king Rājarāja and the village—and this must be sometime before his defeat at Teḷḷāṟu by Kōpperuñjiṅga and his imprisonment at Śēndamaṅgalam in his 15+1st year, according to the Tiruvēndipuram inscription. Lastly, we come across punishment of traitors[3] to the king through the confiscation of their land and other property, as at Shiyali (Tanjore district) in the 7+1st year and 317th day and Valivalam (Tanjore district) in the 14th year. Further the reconciliation[4] between Kūḍal Āḷappiṟandān Mōgan *alias* Kāḍavarāyan and Rājarāja Chēdiyarāyan in the 16th year is obviously intended to give unstinted support to Rājarāja during this phase of the war when the odds were very largely against him. One noteworthy fact in connection with this second phase is that, in an inscription[5] from Tinnevelly dated in the 11th year of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, mention is made of an officer of Hoysaḷa Vīra Sōmēśvara, which must be in evidence of the Pāṇḍya's submission to the Hoysaḷa at the time.

The third phase must have commenced soon after the defeat of Sundara Pāṇḍya at Mahēndramaṅgalam and the restoration of Rājarāja by the Hoysaḷa generals in the 16th year, for we have indirect references in the inscriptions to the commotions and distress caused by the war in this period in the villages. An inscription[6] from Tiruvalañjuḷi (Tanjore district) of the 19th year of Rājarāja, April 1235 A.D., states that 'for a long time the village was subject to many troubles and diseases' and records an exemption of taxes 'for the welfare of the village and the prosperity of the king'. Another[7] from Kōvilūr (Tanjore district) of the 20th year registers a gift of land by the assembly of the village 'for the health of the king and the success of Iruṅgōḷar,' who was perhaps in command of the Chōḷa army.

1. 211 of 1928.
2. 231 of 1925.
3. 393 of 1918. Shiyali, 7+1st year and 317th day; 112/1911, Valivalam, 14th year.
4. 480 and 481 of 1921.
5. 138 of 1894.
6. 205 of 1928.
7. 195 of 1908.

One[1] from Attūr (Tanjore district) of the 22nd year registers a grant of land by the *sabhā* of Rājanārāyaṇa-chaturvēdimaṅgalam 'for the welfare of the king and the village.' Again, instances of confiscation of lands for *rājadrōham*[2] come to light during this period also, as well as cases of fiscal oppression[3] resulting in the abandonment of cultivation. In addition to these references, we have the double *āṇḍu* dates[4] in this period too for Sundara Pāṇḍya, as in the case of Rājarāja. During this third phase it does not appear that Sundara Pāṇḍya had the support of the Ceylonese army, though he could have counted upon the help of Kōpperuñjiṅga. On the other hand, Rājarāja had the active support of Hoysaḷa Narasiṁha and his son Sōmēśvara throughout the length of his reign, so much so that Sundara Pāṇḍya was prevented from unseating Rājarāja permanently and from extending the Pāṇḍya possessions into the Chōḷa country and was checked in his frequent efforts and himself unseated again and again. Just as Sundara Pāṇḍya claimed[5] to have 'assumed the (Chōḷa's) crown' in the coronation hall of the Chōḷas during the 6th-7th year, after he had defeated Rājarāja 'and turned him into the desert for shelter', he experienced the same vicissitude of fortune on nearly a dozen and a half occasions during his reign of about 23 years between 1216 and 1240 A.D. by being obliged to surrender his crown and throne to the Chōḷa king Rājarāja or the Hoysaḷa monarch Vīra Narasiṁha.

Thus we find the interpretation of the double *āṇḍu* as interregnum, signified by the Tiruvēndipuram inscription of Rājarāja III demonstrated in his case, exemplified in the case of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I also. We shall now consider its applicability with equal validity in the case of other Chōḷa kings.

An inscription of the Western Chāḷukya king Āhavamalla *alias* Tailapa II at Kōgaḷi in the Bellary district dated in the Śaka year 914, cyclic year Nandana, mentions a victory over the Chōḷa king.[6] In A D. 973 Tailapa had successfully revolted against his suzerain, the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Kakkala, completely defeated him, asserted his

1. 128 of 1927.
2. 244 and 246 of 1917, Kōyil-Tirumāḷam (Tanj.), 21st year and 80th day; 279 of 1927, Śivapuram (Tanj.), 21+1st year.
3. 98, 96, 104 of 1897, Mannārguḍi (Tanj.), 22nd year and 22+1st year.
4. 13+3rd year for 16th year—141 of 1902; 15+1st year—136 of 1903; 17+1st year—364 of 1904, 11 of 1913; 20+1st year—522 of 1911, 379 of 1906, 96 of 1907 and 308 of 1928, 20+1+1st year for 22nd year—107 of 1907, 309 of 1928; 21+1st year—380 of 1906; and 20th year and 849th day for 23rd year—124 of 1907.
5. *Ante.* p. 5—Tirukkōḷūr inscription.
6. 36 of 1904.

independence and re-established the power of the Western Chāḷukyas which had dwindled into insignificance for over two centuries. The English equivalent date for the Śaka year 914 of this Kōgaḷi inscription of Āhavamalla is A. D. 992, and the Chōḷa king at that time was the great Rājarāja I who reigned from A. D. 985 to 1012. The defeat of Rājarāja I by Āhavamalla sometime in or before A.D. 992 must be a fact as indicated by a record of Rājakēsarivarman at Naṅgavaram in the Trichinopoly district dated in his 3+1st year[1] and another record of Rājakēsarivarman at Tiruvāmāttūr in the South Arcot district dated in the 4+1st year of his reign.[2] Since Rājarāja I's accession has been fixed to have taken place in June-July 985,[3] the 3+1st year and the 4+1st year of his reign correspond to A. D. 988—89 and 989—990. And the date of the Kōgaḷi record of Āhavamalla *alias* Tailapa II is only A.D. 992, and this would show that the event happened sometime before the date of the Kōgaḷi record, for there is an inscription of Āhavamalla at Bāgaḷi dated in Śaka 913, equivalent to A.D. 990,in which there is no reference to the defeat of the Chōḷa king.[4] It is, therefore, certain that the defeat of the Chōḷa king at the hands of Āhavamalla must have occurred during the Śaka year 913—914, and quite possibly in the 4+1st year of his reign, i. e., in the course of the year A. D. 990, during the 5th year of the reign of the great Rājarāja I. And the consequence of the Chōḷa king's defeat must be the temporary deprivation of the throne for him during the year, as indicated by the current year noted opposite to the 4th year of his reign. Similarly the reason for the current year opposite to the 3rd year of reign of Rājarāja I indicated by the Naṅgavaram epigraph must be found in his defeat at the hands of the Pāṇḍyas or the Rāshṭrakūṭas or even a rival claimant to the Chōḷo throne[5] and the consequent cessation of his rule, an interregnum, also in the 4th year of his reign. Rājarāja I could not have been great when he ascended the throne and he must have had his own vicissitudes of fortune in his early years through external wars and internal dissentions and rebellions, and only by dint of persevering endeavours must he have extended his conqnests and established the Chōḷa authority even in the distant sea-girt islands. The submission of the Pāṇḍya king Amarabhujaṅga[6] and

1. 342 of 1903.
2. 27 of 1922.
3. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., P. 54; Mad. Ep. Rep. 1895, Para 9.
4. No. 101 of 1904.
5. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1906, para 16. Cf. 'The Chōḷas', Vol. I, p. 177.
6. *Ibid.*, 1912, para 22 and 1906, para 16.

of the Vaidumba chiefs to Rājarāja I would not have taken place without a hard struggle. The power of the Chōḷas from the last years of Parāntaka I, i.e., about A. D. 940 when the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa III is said to have captured Kachchi (Conjeevaram) and Tañjai (Tanjore) from Parāntaka,[1] down to the first years of the reign of Rājarāja I, was at a very low ebb, and Rājarāja must have made strenuous efforts to maintain his power against the hereditary enemies of the Chōḷas on all sides, to consolidate it and then extend it in all directions, even beyond the sea. As such, his defeat at the hands of the Western Chāḷukya Āhavamalla and the consequential loss of throne for a time must be accomplished facts during the 4+1st, i. e., 5th year, of his reign in A. D. 990.

No. 483 of 1906 at Chauḍūru in the Cuddapah district, dated in Śaka 1114, Paridhāvin, during the reign of the Telugu-Chōḍa Bhujabalavīra Nalasiddhaṇadēva Chōḷa Mahārāja, ruling at Vallūrapura, states that he levied tribute from Kāñchī. The Śaka year 1114 is equivalent to A.D. 1192, and it falls into the 13th—14th year of reign of Kulōttuṅga Chōḷa III who reigned from A. D. 1178 to 1216. Throughout the period of Chōḷa rule from the time of Rājarāja I down to that of Rājēndra III, the sway of the Chōḷas extended into Pottapi-nādu comprising parts of the Cuddapah and Nellore districts wherein the Chōḷa records are found. As such, it is matter of surprise how the feudatory Telugu-Chōḍa chief Nallasiddhaṇadēva who was ruling at Vallūrapura near Cuddapah managed to assert himself so as to be recognised as an independent ruler, to capture Conjeevaram and levy tribute from it. Though Kulōttuṅga III is deemed to have been 'the last of the Chōḷa kings who was powerful[2]' he appears to have had a hard time of it. That he had trouble constantly in his reign is inferable from the revolt[3] of certain traitors at Ponmāṟu in the Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam in the 3rd year of his reign, to put down which he sent a chief from his camp at Karuvili in the Pāṇḍya-maṇḍalam ; the pledge, mentioned in No. 223 of 1904 of 13th year at Mēl-Śēvūr in the South Arcot district, undertaken by two chiefs "to be loyal to Śeṅgēṇi Ammaiappan Rājarāja Śambuvarāyan, 'who took the Pāṇḍya country'; " the agreement given by Kōvan *alias* Rājarāja-Nilagaṅgaraiyan to "help only Rājarāja-Śambuvarāyar, Janaṇātha - Mūvēndaraiyar and Ulaguyyakkoṇḍaśōḷa - Kāḍavarāyar, and none other, in times of need", registered in No. 56 of 1922 of

1. No. 16 of 1905; Mad. Ep. Rep., 1913, para 14.
2. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1912, para 30.
3. *Ibid.* 1913, para 40.

the same 13th year at Tiruvāmāttūr in the same district; the agreement entered into between Rājarājadēvan Ponparappinār *alias* Kulōttuṅga-Chōḻa Vāṇakōvaraiyar of Āragaḷūr and Kiḷiyūr Malaiyamān of Tirukkōvalūr for settling the extent of country belonging to each, for living in friendly relations with each other, for serving the king jointly and for mutually rendering the necessary military assistance by sending each party's chiefs, army and horses to the other in times of need, as recorded in No. 440 of 1913 of the 13th year again from Āragaḷūr in the Salem district:—all the three records being dated in the 13th year of Kulōttuṅga III; and again the compact entered into between Karikāla-Śōḻa Āḍaiyūr-Nāḍāḻvān and Śeṅgēṇi Ammaiyappan Attimallan *alias* Vikrama-Śōḻa Śambuvarāyan as recorded in No. 115 of 1900 from Cheṅgama dated in the 20th year of the king's reign, stipulating that they shall be faithful to each other till the end of their lives, that no alliance shall be formed with or hostility declared against Pirandaperumāḷ, the son of Rājarāja-Adigan, except by mutual approval, and that Śambuvarāyan shall not join the enemies of Nāḍāḻvān; another political agreement recorded in No. 107 of 1900 at Cheṅgama between the above two chiefs and Viḍukāḍaḻagiyaperumāḷ, son of Rājarājadēvan, by which each party pledged itself to be faithful to the other, to reckon the enemies of one party as the enemies of the other party, to form no alliance with certain chiefs including Śiyagaṅgan and to 'observe the provisions of the compact entered in the month of Āvaṇi of the 21st year[1]',—evidently of Kulōttuṅga's reign and hence the date of the record must be later than the 21st year,—and the political pact entered into between Śeṅgēṇi Ammaiyappan Aḻagiyaśōḻan *alias* Edirilišōḻa Śambuvarāyan on the one hand and Ponparappina Vāṇakōvaraiyan, Kulōttuṅgaśōḻa Vāṇakōvaraiyar and the king's brother-in-law Kāḍavarāya on the other, stipulating that the latter should be friends with the former and that neither should act inimically towards the other, recorded in No. 435 of 1913 from Āragaḷūr in the Salem district dated in his 35th year; coupled with the fact that Conjeevaram, which had so long been within the Chōḻa dominions but seemed to have slipped out of Chōḻa rule, shortly before, is said to have been captured by Kulōttuṅga III, 'when his anger abated', after he made the kings of the North prostrate to the ground and levied tribute from the whole Northern region[2], and also defeated

1. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1900, para 32.

2. Mad. Ep. Rep. 1905, Para 19; No. 2 of 1905 of his 24th year=A.D. 1201—2; and No. 360 of 1904 of his 27th year—A.D. 1204—5.

Vīra-Pāṇḍya, gave Madura to Vikrama-Pāṇḍya and took the crowned head of Vīra-Pāṇḍya when he 'faced him at Neṭṭūr' to wipe off his disgrace[1]. Again the war of the Pāṇḍya succession which continued down into his reign is referred to in the records of his 4th year[2], of his 11th year[3], of his 16th year[4] and also of his later years. The two inscriptions of the 16th year mention that 'Vīra-Pāṇḍya, the opponent of the Chōḷa king, took refuge along with his near relations in Kollam (i.e., Quilon in Travancore)'. It is, therefore, possible that Vīra Pāṇḍya, *after his defeat in the battle of* Neṭṭūr and capture along with his queen, as recorded in the inscriptions of Kulōttuṅga's 11th year, gathered fresh forces and obtained fresh contingents from his relative the Kēraḷa ruler and also the Ceylonese king and with this combined army attacked the Chōḷa king once again. Further, No. 460 of 1911 at Āvani in the Kolar district of the Mysore state is found to be dated in the reign of Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷadeva, 'while Vallāḷadēva was ruling the earth'. The date of the inscription is given as 'Saka 1111-12, Saumya, 12th year'. Certainly the Śaka year 1111—12 and the cyclic year Saumya (A.D. 1189-90) correspond to the 12th year of the reign of Kulōttuṅga III. But the way in which Kulōttuṅga's reign is mentioned,—'while Vallāḷadēva was ruling the earth',—would make it appear that the political relation of the Chōḷa king was that of a tributary of the Hoysaḷa king. It is also stated that this Vallāḷadēva, i. e., Ballāḷa II, a contemporary of Kulōttuṅga III, was a powerful potentate who "on the east had shaken Kāñchī, on the west had made the ocean roar while the great Chēra country rose up and fled and the whole of the Pāṇḍya kings took refuge in forests entering even those with fear[5]." To add to these, the Pāṇḍya ruler Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara who came to the throne in A, D. 1190 and ruled for about twenty-eight years seems to have conceived the idea of territorial expansion and invaded the Chōḷa dominions in the South and also successfully occupied them to some extent, for his inscriptions are extant not only in the Tinnevelly district, the limited tract of territory of his predecessors' sway, but also in the Ramnad and Madura districts and 'ruled in Madura

1. No. 66 of 1892, published in South Indian Inspns., Vol. III, part ii, No. 88, pages 217—19; dated in the 19th year corresponding to 12th November, A.D. 1193.

2. No. 1 of 1899. The title 'who took Madurai and the crowned head of the Pāṇḍya' is given in 190 of 1904 of the 2nd year from Tiruvakkarai (South Arcot).

3. No. 3 of 1899. 'The Chōḷas', Vol. II. P. 122.

4. Nos. 42, 43 of 1906.

5. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1912, para 30.

in considerable power[1] ' It is further reported that Tirukkoḍuṅkunramuḍayān *alias* Nishadarājan who, in the 9th year of the reign of Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara Pāṇḍya, whose accession took place in A.D. 1190, made provision for offerings to Kūttanūr-Dēvar and his consort on 27th February, A.D. 1199[2], also figures in a record dated in the 39th year of Kolōttuṅga-Chōḷa III[3] (i. e. A. D. 1216–17), and it is thereon remarked that "this tract (i. e. part of the Ramnad district) over which he was exercising his away thus seems to have passed from the hands of the Chōḷas to the Pāṇḍyas some time after this date[4]."

From all these foregoing facts it would appear that the reign of Kulōttuṅga III was frequently disturbed by attacks from the Pāṇḍyas, the Hoysaḷas and the Telugu-Chōḷas and by the revolts of the Chōḷa feudatory chiefs creating an unsettled state of government. One instance of a serious disturbance comes to light from Nos. 295 of 1911 and 563 of 1921 which are dated in the 12+1st year of Tribhuvanachakravartin Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷadēva, ' who having taken Madura, was pleased to take the crowned head of the Pāṇḍya',—the very same year 13 of his reign in which the first three political compacts were entered into by the different chiefs, especially that recorded in No. 440 of 1913 ' for serving the king jointly,' signifying an actual or a potential disaster. The astronomical details of the date furnished by the latter inscription have been worked out to agree with Monday, the 2nd July A.D. 1190.[5] The *āṇḍu* and the *edir-āṇḍu*, the current and the opposite years, of the reign by means of which the date is indicated, signify a break, an interregnum in his reign, which must be due to his defeat at the hands of his enemies resulting in the deprivation of his throne. The enemy might have been Vira-Pāṇḍya who brought fresh contingents from his relation the Travancore king and attacked him; or the Hoysaḷa king Vīra-Ballāḷa II who claimed to have ' shaken Kāñchī'; or the Telugu-Chōḷa chief Bhujabalavīra Nalla-Siddhaṇadēva-Chōḷa Mahārāja who claimed to have levied tribute from Kāñchī in A.D. 1192. It is also possible that a concerted action took place through a simultaneous attack on Kulōttuṅga on the three sides by the Pāṇḍya, Hoysaḷa and Telugu-Chōḷa rulers, thus hemming in the Chōḷa

1. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri: The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, page 141.
2. No. 297. of 1927—28.
3. No. 320 of 1914.
4. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1927—28, page 56, para 17.
5. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1922, App. E. page 85.

monarch and driving him out of his throne and kingdom. At the same time, the refractoriness, nay, the disloyalty, of certain chiefs and officers of Kulōttuṅga indicated by the avowal of pledges of loyalty of some of them to the king's minister Śeṅgēṇi Ammaiyappan Rājarāja Śambuvarāyan and other chiefs as recorded in the above inscriptions, at different periods of his reign, must have added to his difficulties and dangers. However, he surmounted the frightful situation by defeating the Pāṇḍyas in the South and then by prostrating 'to the ground the kings of the North,' by entering 'Kachchi when (his anger abated)', and by levying 'tribute from the whole Northern region', as he claims to have performed these heroic deeds in his record No. 66 of 1892 at Śrīraṅgam dated in his 19th year corresponding to 12th November A.D. 1196. Thus it is an indubitable fact that Kulōttuṅga III lost his throne in the 13th year of his reign in A.D. 1190, as well as Kāñchī to the Telugu-Chōḷa Nalla-Siddha, and regained the throne immediately thereafter together with Kāñchī from Nalla-Siddha, in or before A.D. 1196. For we find Nalla-Siddha's queen Nūkkamādēvī making a gift of ten *Bhujabala-Māḍai* to the temple at Nandalūr in the 24th year of Kulōttuṅga, corresponding to the cyclic year Dundubhi[1] (=A.D. 1201-2), and Nalla-Siddha himself remitting taxes on three villages, including Nandalūr where the record is engraved, in the 26th year of Kulōttuṅga's reign, corresponding to the cyclic year Raktāksha[2] (=A.D. 1203-4), thereby indicating the subordinate position which Nalla-Siddha submitted himself to as a tributary of Kulōttuṅga III subsequent to A.D. 1192 when he levied tribute from Kāñchī.

Again, No. 136 of 1902 from Tiruvēndipuram in the South Arcot district, which registers a gift of land made at the request of prince (*Piḷḷaiyār*) Vishṇuvardhana-Mahārāja[3], is dated the 22+1st year of the reign of Tribhuvanachakravartin Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷadēva. If this record really belongs to the reign of Kulōttuṅga III, the 22+1st year would correspond to A.D. 1200-1. Then the prince Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja at whose request the grant was made by the king would be the Eastern Chāḷukya prince Mallapa III *alias* Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja who is mentioned as the donor of the grant recorded in the Piṭhāpuram pillar inscription and who is said to have ascended the throne in Śaka[4] 1124 (=1201 A.D.). But the circumstances under

1. No. 601 of 1907.
2. No. 578 of 1907.
3. 'The Chōḷas', Vol. II, p. 56, refers him to the reign of Kulōttuṅga I.
4. Mad. Ep. Rep. for 1893-94, page 4, para 9.

which Kulōttuṅga III was deprived of his throne in or about A.D. 1201, whereby the date of the record is furnished as the year opposite to the 22nd year of his reign, are not clearly made out. They might be due to the aggressive attacks of the Pāṇḍya king Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara who ascended the throne in A.D. 1190, in his attempts at territorial expansion into the Chōḷa dominions and his conquest of the Ramnad and Madura districts and Pudukkota state, partly at least, which enabled him to establish his capital at Madura and rule 'in considerable power'. He was perhaps allied with the Telugu-Chōḷa Nalla-Siddha, who, though precluded from rendering direct help on account of the distance, could have contributed his mite to divert the Chōḷa's attention by continuing to hold Kāñchī and attacking the Chōḷa territories from the North; for it is only a year later, i.e., in the 24th year of Kulōttuṅga's reign, that we find the queen of Nalla-Siddha making a gift of ten *Bhujabala-Māḍai* indicating his acknowledgment of Chōḷa suzerainty. In any event, Kulōttuṅga III's loss of throne, crown and country for a short period in the 23rd year of his reign during A.D. 1200–1 must be an undeniable fact, provided the Tiruvēndipuram inscription No. 136 of 1902 belongs to the reign of Kulōttuṅga Chōḷa III. Otherwise, it must certainly belong to the reign of Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷa I.

If No. 136 of 1902 with the date 22+1st year of Tribhuvana-chakravartin Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷadēva should pertain to the reign of the Chāḷukya-Chōḷa Kulōttuṅga I who occupied the Chōḷa throne in A.D. 1070, the 22+1st or 23rd year would correspond to A D. 1092–3. Then the prince Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja of the record may be identified with either the Chāḷukya-Chōḷa prince Rājarāja II, the son of Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷa I, who was sent by his father as the Viceroy of Vēṅgi only for about a year in A.D. 1077–78 and who was surnamed Sarvalōkāśraya Śrī Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja[1], or with the Eastern Chāḷukya prince Vishṇuvardhana II of the fourth pedigree from Vishṇuvardhana III alias Mallappa III, who was the son of Vijayāditya II and the elder brother of Mallapa II. But it is not certain that prince Rājarāja II survived till the 23rd year of his father's reign and that he was instrumental in making the grant. Consequently the prince Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja mentioned in the Tiruvēndipuram inscription must be identified with the Eastern Chāḷukya Vishṇuvardhana II, son of Vijayāditya II. As regards his date, it can be worked back from the initial date Śaka 1049 (=A.D. 1127)

1. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1921-22, Part II, para 6.

furnished for Vijayāditya III by the Piṭhāpuram pillar inscription by taking it as the last year of his father Mallapa II, and, assigning 20 or 25 years for his rule, we get A.D. 1107 or 1102 as the last year of Vishṇuvardhana II. Likewise by assigning again a period of 20 or 25 years for his rule, we arrive at a period between A.D. 1077 and 1087 for the initial date of Vishṇuvardhana II. If it happened to be the earlier date A.D. 1077, he must have begun to rule as a subordinate of the Chāḷukya-Chōḷa king of Vēṅgi, Rājarāja II, who was recalled by his father in A.D. 1078 and replaced by his elder brother Vikrama-Chōḷa. Since on this rough calculation the rule over Vēṅgi of Vishṇuvardhana II is found to be comprised between the years A.D. 1077 and 1107, the date of the Tiruvēndipuram inscription, A.D. 1092–93, falls into the middle of the period. If then this inscription really relates to the reign of Kulōttuṅga I, it is evident that some catastrophe must have occurred during the 22nd–23rd year of his reign so as to oust him from the throne temporarily, on account of which event the date of the Tiruvēndipuram record is given as the year opposite to the 22nd year of his reign. The first Kaliṅga expedition of Kulōttuṅga I took place before the 26th year of his reign, i.e., A.D. 1095, and it is believed that it had not been successful as no details of the event are recorded. It is, therefore, considered to have been only a preliminary excursion in which, it is inferred, the strong and powerful Trikaliṅga king Anantavarman-Chōḍagaṅga, who ruled from A.D. 1078 to 1146 and " who claims to have replaced the 'fallen lord of Utkala' in his kingdom in the eastern region and the 'waning lord of Vēṅgi in the western region ", ' would have taught the Chōḷas a good lesson on their first invasion[1]. Hence in A.D. 1092–93, in the 22nd+1st or 23rd year of his reign, either in a Chōḷa invasion of Kaliṅga or in an attempt to repel a Kaliṅga invasion of Vēṅgi, Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷa I must have suffered a severe defeat resulting in the temporary loss of his throne, as indicated by the double figure of the date of the Tiruvēndipuram inscription, No. 136 of 1902, viz., the current year opposite to the 22nd year of his reign.

Again, an inscription[2] at Tennēri in the Chingleput district registers a gift of land made for the re-institution of a previous gift for service in the temple, for the welfare of the king, in the 45+1st year of Tribhuvanachakravartin Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷadēva. The Kulōttuṅga-Chōḷadēva whose reign extended up to 45+1st or 46th year is Kulōttuṅga I alone whose reign continued for a period of about 49

1. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1905, Part II, Para 18.
2. No. 224 of 1922.

years from A.D. 1070 to 1118, while that of Kulōttuṅga III covered only a period of about 39 years from A D. 1178 to 1216, and that of Kulōttuṅga II was a short period of about 14 years from A.D. 1133 to 1146. Consequently, the regnal year, 45 + 1st year, of Kulōttuṅga I would correspond to A.D. 1115—16, during which there was a cessation for a time of his rule. This was also the period of the rule of Hoysaḷa Vishṇuvardhana, the brother of Ballāḷa I and the father of Narasiṁha I. He was a local governor in west Mysore under Vikramāditya I, the Western Chāḷukya king of Kalyāṇa, and he extended his away into South Mysore, "seized the Gaṅgavāḍi province and burnt the Gaṅga chief's town Talakāḍ". In A.D. 1116, Hoysaḷa Vishṇuvardhana, "acting of course under his Chāḷukya overlord, succeeded in driving the Chōḷa king out of South Mysore," signifying his successful revolt against Chōḷa domination in South Mysore.[1] In one of his inscriptions dated in A.D. 1133, he claims to have 'brought Kāñchī under his command' and to have 'shook the pride of the Chōḷa[2]. Besides, an inscription of his son Narasiṁha I, dated A.D. 1159, credits him with the occupation of Kāñchī, while a few records of the Uchchaṅgi Pāṇḍya, Vijaya-Pāṇḍya, who was a feudatory of the Western Chāḷukya kings Vikramāditya VI and Jagadēkamalla II successively, ascribe to him the *birudas*, the 'lord of Kāñchīpura' and the 'defeater of the designs of Rājiga-Chōḷa[3].' 'Rājiga-Chōḷa' mentioned in them is no other than Rājēndra-Chōḷa II surnamed Kulōttuṅga I who is referred to by the nick-name 'Rājiga' in the *Vikramāṅkacharita* and in some of the inscriptions of the Western Chāḷukya king Vikramāditya VI. Though 'Rājiga-Chōḷa' is referred to in these records dated between A.D. 1121 and 1170, long after the close of the reign of Kulōttuṅga I (A.D. 1118), the title assumed by Vijaya-Pāṇḍya as the 'defeater of the designs of Rājiga-Chōḷa' cannot but refer to events that took place during the last years of his reign. All these references go to show that Kulōttuṅga I suffered severe reverses in the last years of his reign at the hands of the Western Chāḷukya king Vikramāditya VI supported by his vassals, the Hoysaḷa chief Bittiga *alias* Vishṇuvardhana and the Uchchaṅgi chief Vijaya-Pāṇḍya, that he not only lost the Chōḷa possessions in the Mysore territory, the Gaṅga and Noḷaṁba provinces but was also deprived of the northern portion of his home provinces

1. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., P. 95.

2. *Ibid.* page 99.

3. Ep. Ind., Vol. VII, pages 39-44, Nos. 219, 225, 248 and 250 of Prof. Kielhorn's List of Inspns. of Southern India.

including his second capital Conjeevaram, thereby entailing the bereavement of the Chōḷa throne to him temporarily. There was, therefore, a cessation of his rule for a time in the year of the Tennēri epigraph, No 224 of 1922, viz., the 45+1st or the 46th year of his reign corresponding to A.D. 1116, which coincides with the year of the record of Hoysaḷa Vishṇuvardhana claiming that he 'succeeded in driving the Chōḷa king out of South Mysore', which must be an accomplished fact as revealed by the indication of the *āṇḍu* and the *edir-āṇḍu* furnished for the date of the Tennēri inscription, viz., 45+1st year, instead of the direct mention of the 46th year.

The Chōḷa king Parakēsarivarman, 'who cut off the head of the Pāṇḍya,' or as it is sometimes noted, 'who took the head of Vīra-Pāṇḍya', is mentioned in a large number of inscriptions. The regnal years of the king do not appear to go beyond the 5th year. On account of the short duration of his reign and on the strength of the ascription of the feat of taking the head of the Pāṇḍya king in battle and setting it up 'as a pillar of victory in his city' to Āditya II Karikāla, son of Parāntaka II Sundara-Chōḷa, in the Tiruvāḷaṅgāḍu plates of Rājēndra-Chōḷa I[1], and of the feat of having 'fought in his youth with Vīra-Pāṇḍya' to him in the large Leyden grant[2], this Parakēsarivarman has been identified with Āditya II Karikāla. He was the elder brother of the great Rājarāja I and the immediate predecessor of his uncle, Madhurāntaka Uttama-Chōḷa who ousted Rājarāja from the throne and usurped it himself in A.D. 969–70[3]. His reign of about five years is, therefore, fixed between A.D. 965–66 and 969[4]. From about the end of the reign of Parāntaka I to about the time of accession of Āditya II, the Chōḷa kingdom had suffered attacks from the Rāshṭrakūṭa king Kṛishṇa III 'who captured Kachchi and Tañjai' and set up a pillar of victory at Rāmēśvaram, so much so that a large tract of territory at least in Toṇḍai-nāḍu had passed under his control; and in the south the Pāṇḍyas, too, under Vīra-Pāṇḍya were heading towards independence and reconquest of their lost territory after the triple invasion of the Pāṇḍya country and the taking of Madura by Parāntaka I. Thereby the Chōḷa dominions became crippled and the Chōḷa kings were unable to maintain their power in tact beyond putting up some resistance occasionally, until Rājarāja I undertook a determined campaign of reconquest of terri-

1. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1906, para 16.
2. *Ibid* 1905, para 22.
3. *Ibid.*, 1912, para 19.
4. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., pages 50-51.

tory and extension of Chōḷa supremacy. Consequently Āditya II Karikāla had frequent trouble mainly from the side of the Pāṇḍyas, while possibly his uncle Madhurāntaka Uttama-Chōḷa, who ultimately dethroned his during his fifth year of reign in A.D. 969–70, was actively in rebellion against him.[1] Accordingly, we find at least three periods of interregnum in the short reign of five years of Āditya II, one in the 3rd year as revealed by No. 549 of 1921 at Pullamaṅgai in the Tanjore district which is dated in the 2+1st year of 'Parakēsarivarman'; another in the 4th year as indicated by No. 256 of 1907 at Tiruviḍaimarudūr in the Tanjore district, which is dated in the 3+1st year of "Parakēsarivarman, 'who defeated Vīra-Pāṇḍya and took his head'"; and a third in the 5th year as noted in No. 255 of 1907 from Tiruviḍaimarudūr again, which is dated in the 4+1st year of "Parakēsarivarman, 'who took the head of the Pāṇḍya'". On his part Vīra-Pāṇḍya, in a number of his inscriptions from Tinnevelly, Ambāsamudram (Tinnevelly district), Kiramattūr (Madura district) and Śuchīndram (Travancore State) ranging from the 6th year to the 19th year of his reign, claims that he 'took the head of the Chōḷa'. The assertions of both the opponents cannot be lightly brushed aside as merely boastful claims, in as much as we find gaps in the reigns of both of them. So far it is, therefore, certain that each warred against the other and defeated and deprived the other of his throne and kingdom for a time, whereby their regnal years are reckoned by the employment of the current and opposite years. Hence in the case of 'Parakēsarivarman' Āditya II Karikāla 'who defeated Vīra-Pāṇḍya and took his head' and 'set up his loftly head as a pillar of victory in his city', he suffered the loss of his own crown and kingdom, at least thrice as signified by the method employed in his inscriptions in quoting his regnal years, owing either to the revolt and attack of Vīra-Pāṇḍya, or the rebellion of his uncle Madhurāntaka Uttama-Chōḷa who ultimately dethroned him and murdered him, or even to a combination of these two enemies.

No. 87 of 1900 at Tiruvottūr in the North Arcot district, which is dated in the year opposite the 6th year (6+1st year), i.e., in the 7th year, of the reign of Vikrama-Chōḷa, refers to a big flood which destroyed both the village and the crops. His accession took place in A. D. 1118 and the 6+1st year corresponds to A. D. 1124–25. It is stated that for about ten years prior to his actual accession to the

1. Cf. the account of murder gleaned from No. 577 of 1920 given in 'The Chōḷas,' Vol. I, pp. 191-2. Hence these interregnums may be partly due to Uttamā-Chōḷa's rebellions.

Chōḷa throne, i. e., from A. D. 1108, he was associated with his father Kulōttuṅga I in the government of the kingdom and that the conquest of Kaliṅga 'was actually undertaken by Vikrama-Chōḷa at the end of his father's reign', about his 45th year[1]. Notwithstanding the success of the father and the son in the north in connection with the Kaliṅga expedition, they appear to have lost heavily on the west and the south of their home provinces through the aggressive invasions of Hoysaḷa Vishṇuvardhana (A. D, 1106 to 1141) and of the Western Chāḷukya king Vikramāditya VI supported by his feudatory the Uchchaṅgi Pāṇḍya, Vijaya-Pāṇḍyadēva entitled the 'Lord of Kāñchīpura' and the 'defeater of the designs of Rājiga-Chōḷa'. By A. D. 1117, Vishṇuvardhana seized the Gaṅgavāḍi province and burnt the capital Talakāḍ and 'protected' the Noḷamba province, and thereby freed his country of Mysore of Chōḷa domination, and also made a victorious march right down to Rāmēśvaram[2]. One of his later inscriptions states that 'he brought Kāñchī under his command' and that 'he shook the pride of the Chōḷa[3]'. On his part, Vikramāditya VI claims "to have received homage from the Drāviḍa king who had fled for refuge from '(his) country of many sides (i. e. a country which was in a state of revolt or anarchy[4])'". Thus it is evident that Vikrama Chōḷa was subjected to a defeat and deprivation of his throne temporarily by a commotion generated by the combined forces of the Hoysaḷa, the Western Chāḷukya and the Uchchaṅgi Pāṇḍya in the 6+1st or 7th year of his reign in A. D. 1124–25.

Rājēndra Chōḷa III ascended the throne in A.D. 1246 and reigned for 22 years till the middle of A. D. 1267. His records at Nellore indicate that from A. D. 1244 to 1246 he was associated with Rājarāja III in the administration of the Chōḷa kingdom. It is stated that he was helped to the throne by Hoysaḷa Sōmēśvara. However, his inscriptions state that he was a bitter enemy of Sōmēśvara who, being thoroughly humbled, 'was compelled to put on Rājēndra-Chōḷa's leg, with his own hands, the anklet of heroes', while Sōmēśvara is mentioned in his records 'as having uprooted Rājēndra-Chōḷa in battles and having reinstated him when he begged for protection'. Further Rājēndra claims to have been 'the subduer of the Pāṇḍyas and the Kēraḷas, the plunderer of the Pāṇḍya country, (the hero) whose sword was clever in cutting off the crowned head

1. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1899, para 52.
2. Ibid., 1913, Para 47.
3. Sewell: Histl. Inspns., page 101.
4. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1913, para 48.

of the Pāṇḍya king', and the king 'who took the crowned heads of two Pāṇḍya kings'. It is thus evident that when, as 'the cunning hero who killed Rājarāja (his predecessor) after making him wear the double crown for three years', he ascended the Chōḷa throne, he had a number of enemies to fight against in order to retain his throne. Vīra-Sōmēśvara who had all along actively supported his predecessor was his 'bitter enemy' in that his *protégé* was killed, but 'reinstated him' when Rājēndra 'begged for protection'. The Pāṇḍyas were the hereditary foes of the Chōḷas and he had to contend against Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya II and the great Jaṭāvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I who carried a victorious campaign of conquest up to Nellore in which Vikrama-Pāṇḍya apparently took part. Among the Chōḷa feudatories, there was Kōpperuñjiṅga who for once asserted his independence of Rājarāja's authority in A. D. 1243 and was prepared to maintain it at all costs. In these circumstances Rājēndra Chōḷa's position was precarious. No. 531 of 1904 at Tirutteṅgūr in the Tanjore district which records a remission of certain taxes on oil is dated in the 11+1st or 12th year of Tribhuvanachakravartin Rājēndra Chōḷadēva, which would correspond to A. D. 1257–58. It would appear that Jaṭāvarman Sundara-Pāṇḍya I commenced his career of conquest within two or three years of his accession to the throne in A. D. 1250, as he took Śrīraṅgam from Sōmēśvara, 'the moon of Karṇāṭa,' in A. D. 1253, defeated him and killed him[1]. He then appears to have turned his arms against the Chēra king whom he destroyed and whose country, the Malaināḍu, he plundered. He next marched against the Chōḷa king Rājēndra III, vanquished him and drove him out of his kingdom, captured Conjeevaram and carried his conquests up to Nellore. It is mentioned that Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I 'compelled the warlike Chōḷa of ancient lineage to pay him tribute[2], and it shows that Rājēndra III got back his kingdom by submitting himself as a Pāṇḍya feudatory accepting to pay tribute to the victorious Pāṇḍya. It must have happened in A.D. 1257–58 in the 13th year of Rājēndra which regnal year is accordingly given in the inscription as 12+1st year.

So far the principle of a brief interregnum which is indicated in the Tiruvēndipuram inscription of the 15+1st year of Rājarāja III has been shown to be applicable in the case of the Chōḷa kings, and the Pāṇḍya king Māravarman Sundara I. It may likewise be shown to apply equally to the cases of other Pāṇḍya kings whose regnal years are indicated by the *āṇḍu* and *edir-āṇḍu*. Especially in the case of the Pāṇḍya kings there is a larger number of instances of their regnal years being quoted as the sum of certain current years and opposite years. *(To be continued.)*

1. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1892, para 8.
2. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri: The Pāndyan kingdom, page 161.

REVIEWS.

1. CANDRALEKHA, a drama in Prakrit, by Rudradāsa, authentically edited with a critical Introduction, Notes, Appendix, select glossary etc., by Dr. A. N Upadhye, M A., D. Litt, Professor of Ardhamagadhi, Rajaram College, Kolhapur, published by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, Price Rs. 6-0-0.

2. RASARATNAPRADIPIKA of Allarāja, for the first time critically edited with Introduction, notes and appendices by Dr. R. N. Dandekar, M.A. Ph. D., (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona), published by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, Price Rs. 2-12-0.

3. RISTASAMUCCAYA of Durgadeva, critically edited with exhaustive Introduction, English translation, Sanskrit chaya, Notes, appendix, indices etc., by Dr. A. S. Gopani, M.A., Ph D. (Professor, Singhi Jain Sastra Siksapith, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan), published by the Hon. Registrar, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, Price Rs. 7-8-0.

The Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay is the result of the liberality of Sheth Sri Mungalal Goenka and the indefatigable energy and unsurpassed skill of Sri K M. Munshi. Under the Directorship of the enthusiastic Sri Jina Vijaya Muni, it has developed in various directions during the short period of six or seven years of its existence and the Journal and the publications of the Bhavan bear ample testimony to its successful activities in the literary field. The Singhi Jaina Series is the outcome of the munificence of the late Babu Sri Bahadur Singhji Singhi of Calcutta and the enterprise of Sri Jina Viyayaji Muni. The series was at first issued independently under the patronage of Singhji and the editorship and management of Sri Jina Vijaya Muni ; but in 1945 the editor, in order to place the series on a permanent basis entrusted the Series with the consent of the donor, to the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, at the instance of the founder of the Bhavan, Sri Munshiji. Thus the series and the Bhavan both shine mutually by their association with each other in that the former attained permanence and the latter became an important centre of Jain culture and publication of Jain literature. It is therefore in the fitness of things that the Fifth Volume of the Bharatiya Vidya should be published as the Babu Sri Bahadur Singhji Singhi Memorial volume in memory of the patron

of the Bhavan and the series. The Volume is prefaced by a short account of the life and munificence of Ṣri Bahadur Singhji Singhi from the pen of Sri Jina Vijayaji Muni. It comprises many articles of interest on various subjects of Indology. Dr. A. S. Altekar has contributed an article on the Ancient Indian Educational system. Dr. C. Kunhan Raja has written about Vālmīki, the literary critic. There are three articles on Indian History,—Principal Sri Ram Sarma has discussed some problems of Mughal history, and Sri V. R. Ramachandra Dikshitar, some aspects of the administration of Chandragupta Maurya, and Dr. Dines Chandra Sarcar has written about the city of Bengala. There are two articles of Philological interest—Prof. K. R. Pisharoti in his article on the pronunciation of *-t-* and *-l-* in certain positions attacks the thesis of Dr. Raja that the Sanskrit pronunciation is affected by Malayālam and Prof. C. S. Srinivasachari writes about European pioneer studies in South Indian languages. Acharya T. A. Venkateswara Dikshitar, who was for several years connected with our Institute, discusses the connection of Temple worship as sanctioned in Tāntric works with the Vedic sacrifices and Prof. P. K. Gode contributes a paper on the Regional history of Indian Paper Industry. The article on the Gupta Era by Sri Dhirendra Nath Mookerjee is a reply to an article on the same subject by Prof. P. C. Sen Gupta. The last article is a fragment of "Veśya; synonyms and aphorisms" by Dr. Sternbach Ludwik of Poland. A supplement to the Volume contains the concluding portion of this last article and two other articles, one on Jainism and Meat-eating by Sri M. V. Shah and another on a new Grant of Pāramāra King Bhojadeva from Modasa by Prof. Kariprasad Sastri, besides the text of Acts V and VI of *Viṇāvāsavadatta* edited by Dr. C. Kunhan Raja. The volume thus contains valuable articles of varied interest and forms a fitting memorial to the Founder-member of the Bhavan and the Founder-patron of the Series.

The Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan has already published 8 works in its series of Sanskrit and Prakrit texts and the Singhi Jain series already comprises 18 works of Jain literature. Of the works under review, the *Candralekhā* forms the 6th and the *Rasaratnapradīpikā* the 8th in the Bharatiya Vidya Series and the *Riṣṭsamuccaya* forms the 17th in the Singhi Jain series.

Candralekhā is a saṭṭaka by Rudradāsa. It is edited with critical Introduction, Notes, Appendix, select Glossary etc., by Dr. A. N. Upadhye, Professor of Ardhamagadhi, Rajaram College, Kolhapur. The editor is well-known to the literary world by his many

researches in the Prakrits and by his critical editions of several Prakrit and Apabhraṁśa works. He has once more earned the gratitude of Prakrit scholars and linguists by editing this valuable and interesting work.

Saṭṭaka is a species of Indian drama written almost entirely in Prakrit. It is defined by our author himself. It resembles a Nāṭikā to a great extent. There should be no Praveśaka or Viṣkambhaka in it and its divisions are termed Yavanikāntaras. Till recently Rājaśekhara's *Karpūramañjarī* was the only example of the species available to the world of scholars, the rest being known only through quotations. So the publication of the *Candralekhā* must be welcomed by all scholars.

In the Introduction the learned editor first treats of the critical apparatus available to him and the methods employed by him in the constitution of the text of the play. Next he gives a summary of the plot and the synoptic analysis of the play. This is followed by an account of the evolution of the Saṭṭaka and its place in the history of the Indian drama. Incidentally the editor supplies his readers with an account of the saṭṭakas known so far in Indian literature. The editor next compares the present work with the *Karpūramañjarī* and dwells on the literary merits of the former; and finally treats of the language and metres in the play. The introduction closes with an account of the author, Rudradāsa. The editor concludes that the author possibly wrote the *Candralekhā* sometime about 1660 A.D. and so the importance of the play does not consist in its antiquity but in being a specimen of a rare species.

The text has been constituted as best as can be done on the basis of a single manuscript without regard to the grammatical standards and the editor deserves to the congratulated on the results attained by him; but one feels that in evident cases of corruption of text, such as फलिअ for the grammtical फलिह which occurs in the seventh line following besides elsewhere and समिड्ढि for समिद्धि, the editor could have paid more respect to the grammatical standards, however untrustworthy they may be in other respects. The derivation suggested by the editor for the term Saṭṭaka does not also appear to be convincing. A compound of a Sanskrit word with a Dravidian word is inadmissible and unknown. Saṭṭaka is of course un-Sanskritic in form like *naṭṭaā* and is evidently a re-formate from Prakrit *saṭṭaā*. But there is nothing to prevent us from assuming Sāṭaka, its variant, to be Sanskrit like Nāṭaka. And as Nāṭaka can be derived

from *naṭ* (a variant of *nṛt*), so Sāṭaka can be derived from the root *saṭ* or *sāṭ* signifying "display, manifest" and there is no necessity to invoke the Dravidian languages for the derivation of the term. It is not therefore necessary also to suppose it to be an attributive to a suppressed term. Like the other terms Nāṭaka, Nāṭikā, Prakaraṇa etc., it can be a substantive. With regard to the origin of the character of Vidūṣaka, we have long ago[1] discussed the subject and have proved that he was originally a character of the theatre subsequently transferred into the plot and recognised as a regular *dramatis persona.*

The account of the other Saṭṭakas furnished by the editor reveals a new fact with regard to the enactment of dramas in royal courts in our country. From an examination of the plays containing *garbha-nāṭakas,* we were led to believe that dramas were enacted in the musical apartments of the Kings in the afternoons or evenings. But the *Anandasundarī* refers to the enactment of a drama in the forenoon, just before midday.

The learned editor has discussed at length the forms of the Prakrit that can be admitted into the prose and verse of the dramas and comes to the conclusion that the tradition of manuscripts has to be given preference over grammatical standards and he has constituted the text of the *Candralekhā* according to this canon of textual criticism. It would have been of immense advantage to Prakrit scholars if he had given a detailed grammatical analysis and word index of the language of the play, the text of which has been constituted as above. They would have also been helpful to scholars in judging the results arrived at by him by adopting the method.

The notes given by the editor at the end are both critical and explanatory and the Appendix exhibits all the remarks and extracts on Saṭṭaka in the Rhetorical works. With regard to the note on I 29.6, we may add that the saying is found quoted in the *Ratnāvalī* of Sri Harṣa also. There is an index (called glossary) of "important words which deserve the attention of the students of Prakrit vocabulary" at the end of the work, but we cannot understand on what principle these words have been picked up. We fail to see how several words in it deserve the attention of scholars.

The book is printed at the well-known Nirnaya Sagara Press which is noted for its excellent types and high style printing in

1. In a paper on Vidūṣaka submitted to the Third All-India Oriental Conference held at Madras.

Devanāgarī characters. The printing and get up of the book are excellent and there are very few printing mistakes. One अंगराओ seems to have been lost in line IV, 14.2. The rendering of मा by मां in line III. 11c. and of णवर by नवरं in lines III. 5d and IV. 9d in the chāyā appears to be doubtful. Finally we have nothing but praise to the editor for bringing out in the most up-to-date fashion of editing a very important specimen of a rare species of Indian drama which also adds considerably to our knowledge of Prakrit literature and we heartily join the general editor in offering his sincere congratulations to the editor and confidently endorse his "great hopes that in the near future Dr. Upadhye will give us many valuable Prakrit works with learned Introductions which are usually the results of his study and mature scholarship."

Rasaratnapradīpikā is a Sanskrit work by Allarāja dealing with the theory of *rasa* in Rhetoric. It is edited with an Introduction in English, Notes and Appendices by R. N. Dandekar, M.A. Ph.D., of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona. In the Introduction the editor first gives an analysis of the contents of the work, then discusses the age of the author, Allarāja, and lastly supplies us with an account of the manuscript material on which the edition is based. From the analysis of the contents we see, as the editor himself has been convinced, that the author Allarāja has nothing new to say about the subject of his treatise and cannot lay any claim to originality. He has borrowed freely from earlier writers (including most of his illustrations) and can be credited only with the preparation, or rather compilation, of a small handbook on the subject of *rasa*, as the editor has admitted. The book cannot lay claim to any high antiquity either, as the date of the author has been fixed between 1175 and 1350 A.D.; the author too "does not seem to have been an important sovereign from the political point of view," his name being known only from this literary work.

The work consists of six chapters or *paricchedas*. The first is a kind of introductory chapter and treats of *rasa* in general. The second chapter deals with *bhāva* and *sthāyibhāva* while the third and the fourth chapters deal with the *vibhāvas*, *anubhāvas* and *sattvikabhāvas* and *vyabhicāribhāvas*. The fifth chapter deals with the eight *rasas* and their several varieties. The sixth chapter is devoted to the discussion of some general questions regarding *rasa* such as the colour of *rasas*, antagonism between them, semblance of *rasa*, agreeableness of certain *rasas*, etc. Both with regard to his definitions

and his examples, Allarāja has borrowed freely from the *Daśarūpaka Nāṭyaśāstra* and other rhetorical works, acknowledging only in the case of the *Nāṭyaśāstra.* The Editor's notes and Appendix II at the end of the volume clearly reveal the extent to which our author is indebted to others in the composition of his work; and we feel that the remark of the editor on page 46 regarding stanza 23 in chapter second is well-directed. In the case of examples which our author has independently collected, he is not always happy, as for example, stanza 12 on page 5, quoted as an example of *hāsa.* The names of works and authors mentioned by name in the work are given alphabetically, with remarks as to their age, in Appendix I and an alphabetical index of the stanzas quoted is given in Appendix III.

Notwithstanding the little literary and historical value of the work, the editor has spared no pains in his labour to supply us with a critical edition of the same with all the appendages or accessories of modern style of editing. The printing and get up of the work leave nothing to be desired and the editor has to be congratulated on his success in producing a really critical edition of a hitherto unpublished treatise on a difficult topic in Rhetoric. The book can be recommended as a useful manual to beginners in Alaṅkāraśāstra.

Riṣṭasamuccaya by Durgadeva is a short treatise in 261 Prakrit stanzas on the art of prognosticating good or bad through portents in the form of bodily signs, unusual phenomena, shadows, dreams, birds, asterisms, etc. This is the first editorial work of Sri A. S. Gopani, M.A. Ph.D., Professor of Jaina literature in the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. The work was originally submitted as a thesis for the Ph. D. Degree of the Bombay University and was carried on under the supervision, direction and guidance of Sri Jina Vijaya Muni, Director of the Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. The work is edited with an introduction, Sanskrit *chāya,* literal English translation, notes, an appendix and several indexes. The introduction deals, among other things, with the critical apparatus, the author and his works, a critical study of the text, and a general discussion of the *riṣṭas.* The editor concludes that the language of the work is in general Śauraseni with an admixture of Mahārāṣṭri and Jaina-Māgadhi; and he has included in the introduction an account of the salient features of the language of the work. In the general discussion of the *riṣṭas*, the editor has supplied us with the standpoint not only of the Indians but of other nations like the Greeks and Romans and has collected a lot of interesting information about the different kinds of omens,

In the early stages of civilization, the people living in a wild state were attracted by the natural phonomena and attributed them to super-human agencies in their simplicity. All usual phenomena were attributed to the normal state of the super-human powers but any aberration or deviation from the norm was considered to be conducive to unusual human occurances. Thus if the sun or the moon shone brightly there was happiness on the earth ; but if the sun or the moon was troubled by an eclipse, there must be corresponding trouble on the earth and evils in this world thus came to be connected with unusual natural phenomena. The bodily portents were, perhaps, the results of experience. If a man on the point of death, could not see or hear things as they were owing to loss of the power of the organ, such signs in man were, conversely attributed to his approaching end. The subject of dreams and augury is more difficult to tackle with. Certain dreams, perhaps, were the result of abnormal state of the brain preceding the unhealthy condition of the body and these gave the impetus for the people to generalize about the effects of good and bad dreams. Portents relating to birds and animals were also, likewise, the results of generalizations of particular accidental happenings. Whatever may be the origin of these *riṣṭas* or omens, their comparative study is very interesting and we must be very grateful to the editor for supplying us with a very interesting study of them from all points of view in the Introduction. The study of the present work in comparison with other works on the subject conducted by the editor shows the development of the ideas about the *riṣṭas* in different ages and communities. The editor leaves out of his consideration no possible aspect of the subject from discussion in his Introduction. The Notes supply additional information about the *riṣṭas* and also deal with the linguistic peculiarities of the work. All the passages about the omens in Sanskrit literature from the *Atharvaveda* down to the *Dharmasindhu* and those found in Jaina literature are collected in the Appendix and they are thus made easily accessible for comparative study. Indexes of stanzas and of words found in the work are given at the end, followed by indexes of subjects both in Sanskrit and English. The names of all works consulted in the preparation of the edition are collected in the Bibliography. The book is thus presented with all the information that is necessary for a comprehensive and comparative study of the subject thereof, and the editor is to be congratulated on the splendid work that he has accomplished.

But there is one thing in the work which has distracted us very much while going through it and that is the very large number of abbreviations used by the editor in the Introduction and elsewhere. The abbreviations are all of his own devising and not standard ones, being those of all the works consulted by him. We can easily understand and pass over recognised abbreviations like AV. (*Atharvaveda*), BI. (*Bibliotheca Indica*), IA. (*Indian Antiquary*), MBh. (*Mahābhārata*) and Sing. (Singular) but abbreviations of each and every work mentioned by him, some of which are indeed very rare and not even printed, are too much for the patience of the reader. It has been a very disgusting task for us to refer to the list every now and then to make out the abbreviations for understanding the full significance of the remarks. However economical they may be with regard to space and time, they are painful to the eye and stumbling blocks to the mind.

P. V. RAMANUJASWAMI

Sandeśarāsak of Abdul Rahamana, (in Apabhramśa language), with two commentaries—Vṛtti and Avacūrika—Edited with Introduction, Notes, Index, etc. by Sri Jinavijaya Muni and Prof. Harivallabha Bhayani pp. 18+106+124. Published by Bhāratīya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay. 1945. Price Rs. 7. 8 as.

The work under review is a fine literary piece in Apabhramśa language interspersed with Prakrit on the lines of the Dūta Literature in Sanskrit. The work under notice arouses our interest all the more to the fact that this fine lyrical poem is from the pen of a Muhamedan poet who may be credited with being the first Muslim poet to assimilate Hindu culture and write poems in Prakrit and Apabhramśa dialects. In the Introductory portion of his poem the author describes himself as a weaver of Muslim community named Addahamāna (in Aprabhramśa which is rendered by the commentators as Abdul Rahamana in Sanskrit), son of one Mirasena of the famous Mleccha country in the west (Prakrama 1. verse 3, 4.). The author further says that he was famous for his songs and poems in Prakrit (verse 4.) But for these statements by the author himself there is no other means for ascertaining that the work under review was composed by a non-Hindu writer viz. a Muslim poet. The theme of the poem is the message sent through a traveller from Vikrampur by a lady suffering long separation, to her beloved husband who had gone to Cambay to earn riches. The whole poem consisting

of 223 verses is divided into three sections called Prakrama. Like the *Pūrva-megha* and *Uttara-megha* of Kālidāsa's *Megha-dūta*, these Prakramas show a turn in the development of the poetic theme. Thus the first Prakrama seems to be introductory. With the second Prakrama begins the theme proper, while the third occupies itself with the Ṣaḍṛtuvarṇana in the context of a Virahiṇī and brings the theme to a close.

Sri Jina Vijaya Muni amply deserves to be congratulated for bringing out this *editio princeps* of this important work with two commentaries. The present text is based on three Mss. and the foot-notes refer to all the variants. The editor's prefatory notes include among other things a formal description of the three Mss., the date of the author etc. It is pointed out, on the strength of internal and external evidence, that the author, viz., Abdul Rahamāna, might have flourished during the time of Siddharāja or Kumārapāla i.e., in the middle of 12th century A.D.

There are two valuable commentaries on the text viz., one Tippaṇīrūpa vyākhyā also called vṛtti, written in broken Sanskrit by one Lakṣmicandra who is assigned by the editor to the end of 14th century A.D. and another Avacūrikā, which is a chāyā-like Sanskrit commentary (anonymous). Both these commentaries are very helpful in understanding the poem and but for these two commentaries which lucidly explain the verses, their obscure meaning would have remained unintelligible to the readers.

The value of the edition is highly enhanced by the scholarly 'critical study' by Prof. Harivallabha Bhayani, M.A., which in its four sections presents a thorough study of the work and which includes 'Grammar', 'Metres', 'Form and structure', and 'Summary of the Contents'. There are several appendices giving (1) an alphabetical index of all the verses, (2) a unique word-index of all Apabhraṁśa and Prākrit words used in the text, with their chāya in Sanskrit, (3) alphabetical lists of flowers, plants and trees, (4) proper names and (5) Metres. The general get-up of the book leaves nothing to be desired. The editors have done their work creditably and we commend this publication to all lovers of Apabhraṁśa Literature and to those who occupy themselves with the study of linguistics.

Digvijayamahākāvyam of Meghavijaya Gani, Edited with Introduction, Tippaṇi, etc. by Ambalal Premchand Sāha. pp. 10+14+144. Published by Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan. Singhi Jain Series, No. 14. 1945. Price Rs. 5 12 as.

The work under notice is a remarkable composition of Sanskrit Literature describing the life of Vijayaprabha Sūri, who was the sixty-first in descent from Mahāvīra in the pontifical line. Meghavijaya Gaṇi, the author of the work under review, was a Jaina monk of the Śvetāmbara sect. He was a pupil of Kṛpāvijaya and fifth in heirarchical descent from Hīravijaya. He was a genius of great versatility and his works embrace every field of literature in Sanskrit+Prākrit, such as Grammar, Literature, Logic, Astronomy, Philosophy, etc. As a poet, his greatness is sufficiently proved by his *Saptasandhāna-mahākāvya*, in which the poet (Meghavijaya) applies each verse to seven Tīrthaṅkaras at a time, in a very felicitous language all the same. In his *Digvijaya-mahākāvya* the biography of Vijayaprabha Sūri is described in 13 cantos. It was composed in V. S. 1747 (1691 A.D.). In the 1st and 2nd cantos, the poet gives a description of Jambūdvīpa and Bharata-varṣa respectively. In the 3rd canto, life and teachings of Mahāvīra, the founder of Jainism is briefly described. The remaining cantos narrate the life-history, pilgrimages, the acts of social and religious service rendered by Vijayaprahha Sūri and other incidents in his life. Modelled on the design of the well-known *Śankara-digvijaya-kāvya*, the work under review has an originality of narration and description and graceful blend of classical imagery. Being a Mahākāvya, the poet adheies to the canons of poetics in describing the various phenomena of nature, such as, the seasons, cities, mountains, oceans, rivers etc. The chief merit of the work under review is that it is an honest attempt to give facts of history and reflects the social and sectarian conditions of the Jainas and many details of other contemporary social and political conditions are also available. Further, it affords a very interesting reading from cover to cover and the reader has the pleasure of being in the company of a great poetic and philosophic mind.

The editor, Ambala Premchand Sāha has done his work in a thorough-going manner. In the introduction, the editor has given a brief account of the life and works of the author. The format and the get up of the volume is quite pleasing and is in line with the other publications of the Bhāratīya Vidyā Bhavan.

N. S. S.

ANNALS

We are sorry to note that owing to indifferent editorial work, the appearance of the last part of the Journal has been marred by several printing mistakes as well as mistakes of other kinds. We are more aware of them than our readers and crave their indulgence.

* * * * *

We regret to record the sad demise of Prof. P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri, B.A. (Oxon) M.A. (Madras), Professor of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology in the Presidency College, Madras. He occupied many responsible positions in Government service before becoming Professor in the Presidency College. He was editor of several works, the most important of which is the South Indian recension of the *Mahābhārata*. His connection with this Institute commenced early in 1942 when he was nominated a member of the Advisory Council of the same. He was a man of strong convictions and expressed his opinions without fear or favour. At a meeting of the staff of the S. V. Oriental Institute and College, a condolence resolution was passed and communicated to the son of the late Professor. We take this opportunity of recording our heartfelt sorrow at his premature demise and of offering our condolences to the members of his bereaved family.

* * * * *

The term of office of the previous President having expired, Dewan Bahadur Sir G. Narayanaswami Chetti, Kt., C.I.E., J.P. has recently been elected President of our T. T. Devasthanams Committee. We offer our hearty felicitations and welcome to the new President. He is well-known for his liberal views and we hope that the Oriental Institute and College will develop further under his fostering care.

* * * * *

We received an article in Telugu on Telugu Prabandhas by Sri S. Ramakrishna Sastri, M.A., sometime Asst. Editor; but as it was incomplete, we could not publish it in the Journal.

* * * * *

The following books have been gratefully received.

		Rs.	A.	P.
1.	Highways and Byways of Literary Criticism in Sanskrit by the Late M. M. Kuppuswami Sastri, M.A., I.E.S., S. K. Sastri Research Institute, Madras	2	0	0
2.	In the Temple of Truth—By G. Ramakantacharya, Bapatla	1	0	0
3.	Tolkappiya-Colladikaram with an English commentary—By P. S. Subramanya Sastri, Annamalai University	5	0	0
4.	The Metaphysics of Sri Ramanuja—By K. C. Varadachari, Professor of Philosophy, S. V. College, Tirupati			
5.	Investigations into Pre-historic Archaeology of Gujarat (Baroda State)			
6.	Suddharaja-Yoga—By Hamsa Yogi. Ed. Janardan, Suddha Dharma Office, Mylapur Madras ...	5	3	0
7.	Mahatma Hamsa Raj			
8.	Sataragaratnamalika—By T. N. Ch. Venkatanarayanacharyulu, Srinivasa Nilayam, Brodiepet, Guntur			
9.	Sandesarasaka—By Abdul Rahaman. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay	7	8	0
10.	Digvijaya-Mahakavya—By Meghavijaya. Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay	5	12	0
11.	Silver Jublilee Volume of Sri Vallabha—Ramasaligrama-Sangaveda Vidyanilaya, Benares ...			
12.	Adhunika Tatvasastram—By Hanumanta Rao, University of Mysore			
13.	Riṣṭasamuccaya, of Durgadevacarya, Ed. A. S. Gopani, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan ...	7	8	0
14.	Candralekha of Rudradasa—Ed. A. N. Upadhye Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay ...	6	0	0
15.	Rasaratna Pradipika of Allaraja—Ed. R. N. Dandekar, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay ...	2	12	0
16.	Bharatiya Vidya, Vol. V—Miscellany, Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan	4	0	0
17.	The Suddha Dharma—Gita Day Number. Vol. VI, No. 3. Suddha Dharma Office, Mylapore, Madras			

सन्देशद्वयसारास्वादिनी ।

[Matatiayasārāsvādī, Mīmāṃsāiatnam Sri A. V. Gopalachariar M.A., B.L. is well-known to the world of Sanskrit scholars by his many commentaries and his well-known defence of Viśiṣṭādvaita philosophy against the attacks of Advaitins. He has written a comparative appreciation of the *Meghadūta* of Kālidāsa and *Haṁsa-sandeśa* of Vedāntācharya, called the *Sandeśadvayasārāsvādinī*. A small portion from this work is published here to bring it to the notice of orientalists. — ED.]

(२२) तत्रारूढैर्महति मनुजैः स्वर्गिभिश्चावतीर्णैः
सत्त्वोन्मेषाद्व्यपगतमिथस्तारतम्यादिभेदैः ।
साधारण्यात्फलपरिणतेः संघशो बध्यमानां
शक्त्या कामं मधुविजयिनस्त्वं च कुर्याः सपर्याम् ॥ २२ ॥

हंससन्देशः

"अग्रेभावी तदनु नयने रञ्जयन्नञ्जनाद्रिः" इति पूर्वश्लोकान्ते गीतम् । अञ्जनाद्रिः स्वमारूढानां निरञ्जनतां सम्पादयतीति वैचित्र्यं प्रदर्श्यते । सिद्धाञ्जनघनोऽयमञ्जनाद्रिः । न तत्र मलीमसतापादकाञ्जनगन्धोऽपि । "निष्कलं निष्क्रियं शान्तं निरवद्यं निरञ्जनं" इति श्वेताश्वतरोक्तरीत्या यथा भगवान् निरञ्जनः तथा स स्वापारकरुणया ।

"यदा पश्यः पश्यते रुक्मवर्णं कर्तारमीशं पुरुषं ब्रह्मयोनिम् ।
तदा विद्वान्पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति ॥"

इति मुण्डकोक्तरीत्या श्रवणमननादिपरिपाकदशया भगवद्द्रष्टॄणां पुण्यपापविधूननपूर्वकं निरञ्जनतामनुगृह्य स्वेन परमं साम्यं वितरति । भगवत्स्वभावोऽयमद्रिः ।

"महान्प्रभुर्वै पुरुषः सत्त्वस्यैष प्रवर्तकः"

इति श्राव्यते । सत्त्वप्रवर्तकत्वं भगवत्स्वभावः । भगवन्निवासभूतगिरेरपि सत्त्वप्रवर्तकत्वं पाप्मापहत्या निरञ्जनीकरणं तारतम्यापोहनं साम्यप्रदानं च स्वभावः । अञ्जनाद्रिनामनि अञ्जनपदं निरञ्जनतापादनसमर्थसिद्धाञ्जनग्राहकमिति व्युत्पाद्यतेऽत्र । अनेन सिद्धाञ्जनेन दिव्यं चक्षुरुन्मील्यते । मांसचक्षुर्दिव्यचक्षुः क्रियते । अस्य गिरेर्वेङ्कटनाम पाप्मदाहकशक्तिमत्त्ववाचकम् । वेमिति पापार्थकमव्ययम् । कट दाहे । वेदान्तेषु पुण्यमपि पाप्मतुल्यं, संसारवर्धनेन मुक्तिरूपाभीष्टश्रेयःप्रतिबन्धकत्वात् ।

"धर्मं त्रैवर्गिकं च स्वयमिह निगमः पाप्मकोटौ पपाठ"

इति तत्त्वमुक्ताकलापे उक्तमनेनैव कविना। पुण्यपापविधूननदक्षो वेङ्कटगिरिः। निरञ्जनता-प्रदानदक्षः अञ्जनगिरिः। इत्थं चास्मिन् श्लोके उच्यमाने सत्त्वोन्मेषतारतम्यापोहनने गिरिनाम्ना समर्थ्येते। तत्र पूर्वश्लोकान्तिमपदोक्तेऽञ्जनाद्रौ। 'आरूढैः' गिर्यारूढत्वं योगारूढ-त्वमुक्त्याऽऽरूढत्वतुल्यमहिमवत्। प्रथममत्र मनुजाः, अनन्तरं स्वर्गिणश्च कीर्त्यन्ते। तत्र कारणं, मनुजाः आरूढाः, देवा अवतीर्णाः। 'महति' महति अद्रौ। निरुपपदमह-च्छब्दो निरतिशयमहिमप्रतिपादकः। महिमाचोत्तरत्र वर्ण्यते। स्वारूढान् मुक्त्यारूढानिव करोतीति महिमा। महच्छब्देन "महान्प्रभुर्वै पुरुषः सत्त्वस्यैष प्रवर्तकः" इति श्रुतिः प्रत्यभिज्ञाप्यते अनन्तरपादवक्ष्यमाणसत्त्वोन्मेषप्रदानसमर्थनाय। इत्थं च काव्यलिङ्गम्। 'मनुजैः'—मनुजस्वर्गिभेदतारतम्यादिकं प्रसिद्धम्। मनुजस्वर्गिणोर्महान्तरवतोर्भेद-तारतम्यादिकं व्यपनीयते महागिर्यारोहप्रभावेण। अत्रोक्त'मनुजैः स्वर्गिभिश्चे'ति तरतम-भावघटितविभागः अपनीयते गिरिशिखरप्राप्त्या तत्रस्थभगवत्सेवया च। उत्तरार्धे अपनेष्यमाण-त्वेनोक्तस्य भेदस्यात्रानुवादः क्रियते 'मनुजैः स्वर्गिभिश्चे'ति पृथङ्निर्देशेन। गिर्यारूढमनुज-सामानाधिकरण्यलाभाय सौलभ्यपूर्णभगवत्सेवार्थं च स्वर्गिभिः परमपदवासिभिः परमपदाद-वतीर्यते। 'स्वर्गिभिश्च'—स्वर्लोकः कर्मिणां परमं सुखस्थानम्। स्वर्लोके स्वर्गशब्द-प्रयोगः औपचारिकः।

"यन्न दुःखेन संभिन्नं न च ग्रस्तमनन्तरं।
अभिलाषोपनीतं च तत्सुखं स्वःपदास्पदम्॥"

इत्युक्तं लक्षणं मोक्ष एवान्वेति। 'न स्वर्गेऽपि पातभीतस्य क्षयिष्णोर्नास्ति निर्वृतिः' इत्युक्तरीत्या पातभयकालपरिच्छेदादिमत्तया प्रसिद्धे स्वर्लोके। स्वार्गिणां मुक्तिस्थानादत्रागमनं भगवदवतारवन्महनीयमिति द्योतनाय 'अवतीर्णै'रिति प्रयुज्यते। यथा भगवान् स्वर्गा-दत्रार्चामूर्त्यावतीर्णः तथा स्वर्गिणोऽपि। श्रुत्युक्तं तेषां भगवदनुसंचरणमन्वर्थ्यते। आरूढा-नामवतीर्णानाञ्च सन्धिः संघश्च। तथा मनुजस्वर्गिणाम्। सत्त्वोन्मेषात्, सत्त्वविवृद्ध्या। 'सत्त्वात्संजायते ज्ञानम्'। क्षेत्रप्रभावात् सत्त्वमुन्मिषति। दिव्यं चक्षुश्चोन्मीलति। 'व्यपग-तमिथस्तारतम्यादिभेदैः'। मनुजस्वर्गिणां मिथो भूयस्तारतम्यं प्रसिद्धम्। तच्च तारतम्यं निश्शेषं व्यपैति मनुजानां सत्त्वोन्मेषात्। स्वर्गिविषये सत्त्वोन्मेषकथनं सिद्धानुवादः। वर्गद्वयस्यापि साधारणः सत्त्वोन्मेषः स्वर्गिणां सिद्धः, मनुजानां तु गिर्यारोहलब्धः। व्यपगतेत्यत्र वि, अप, इत्युपसर्गद्वयेनात्यन्तापहतिर्द्योत्यते। 'मिथस्तारतम्यं'—'मनुजस्वर्गिणां मिथस्तारतम्यं, मनुजेषु

मिथस्तारतम्यं च। स्वर्गिषु न जात्यादिभेदः। न वा सत्त्वतारतम्यम्। चातुर्वर्ण्यप्रसिद्धजातिभेद-भिन्ना मनुजाः। गुणकर्मविभागशश्चातुर्वर्ण्यं सृष्टम्। जात्यादिभेदकृतवैषम्यं च व्यपैति स्वामि-सेवाकाले। नानावर्णानां मनुजानां मिथस्संमर्दो भवति संघशः सपर्यारचनकाले। सेवार्थिसंघेषु न मिथो विभागः। व्यतिकरेणाविशेषस्सर्वेषां संमर्द एव भवति। 'व्यपगतमिथस्तारतम्यादिभेदैः' इत्यनेन 'परमं साम्य'मिति श्रुतिः स्मार्यते। मिथस्तारतम्यं व्यपनीयते। भगवदपेक्षयास्ति जगद्व्यापारवर्जत्वं नाम मनाङ्वैषम्यम्। जीवानां मिथस्तारतम्यं तु अत्यन्तं व्यपैति। तारतम्यादिभेदा अपगच्छन्ति। स्वरूपभेदस्तु वर्तत एवेति व्यज्यते तारतम्यादिभेदमात्रस्य व्यपगमवर्णनेन। "वीतरागभयक्रोधा मन्मया मामुपाश्रिताः" इति गायति भगवान्। श्रुतिश्च 'सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः' इति सूरिबहुत्वं भगवत्स्वरूपस्य बहुसूरिदृश्यमानत्वं च गायति। "साधारण्यात् फलपरिणतेः—फलपरिपाकस्य सामान्यत्वात् सर्वेषां भगवत्सपर्याप्रसक्तानां मोक्षरूपफलपरिणामस्य समानत्वादित्यर्थः" इति रसास्वादिनीव्याख्या। साधारण्यादिति पदेन सामान्यालंकारोऽपि सूच्यते। 'स स्वर्गः स्यात्सर्वान्प्रत्यविशिष्टत्वात्' इति सूत्रितं जैमिनिना। त्रैवर्गिकफलेषु तदुत्तमं स्वस्माद्विशिष्टरहितं स्यान्नाम, न तस्यात्यन्तं स्वविशिष्ट-स्वोत्तमान्तरराहित्यमिति व्यञ्जितं बादरायणेन विकल्पाधिकरणे 'विकल्पोऽविशिष्टफलत्वा'दिति जैमिनिसूत्रस्थाविशिष्टपदमेव निवेशयता। न स्वर्गाद्विशिष्टमस्तीति जैमिनिः कर्मसूत्रप्रणेता। न मोक्षफलाद्विशिष्टमस्तीति मोक्षसूत्रप्रणेता। स्वर्गे तारतम्यादिभेदानां भूयस्त्वं प्रसिद्धम् यथार्थनाम्नि स्वर्गे। मोक्षे तु सर्वतारतम्याभावः प्रसिद्धः। विशेषरूपतारतम्यप्रचुरं स्वर्गफलम्, न तथा मोक्षफलम्। मेघश्लोकान्मनसि विपरिवर्तयता कविना हंससन्देशः प्रणिन्ये। मेघस्य त्रयोविंशश्लोके "परिणतफलश्यामजम्बूवनान्ताः" इति पठितम्। तच्छ्लोकानुभवा-वसरेऽस्य विस्तरो द्रष्टव्यः।—'संघशो बध्यमानां'—संघशः अविशेषेण सर्वैः सपर्या बध्यते। सपर्याबन्धनेन सर्वबन्धविगलनं सम्पद्यत इति रसोऽनुभाव्यः। 'शक्त्याकामं'—शक्तिर्ना-माधिकारः। भगवत्सपर्यायां सर्वेषामधिकारस्साधारणः। यथेप्सितमित्यर्थकेन काममिति पदेन इच्छैवालाधिकारसम्पादिकेति व्यज्यते। अर्थित्वे सति सामर्थ्यमिति अधिकारलक्षणम्। भगवत्सेवायामर्थित्वरूपकाममात्रमलं शक्तिरूपाधिकारसम्पत्त्यै। शक्त्येत्यस्य 'यथा शक्ति' इत्यर्थः। तस्य तस्य शक्तिमनतिक्रम्य यथाशक्ति सपर्याकरणे पूर्णफललाभः। न सर्वेषां साधनमेकपरिमाणम्। शक्तितारतम्येन साधनानुष्ठाने न्यूनाधिकभावः स्यादेव। न तादृश-साधनतारतम्येन फलतारतम्यम्। कारुणिको भगवान् यथाशक्ति सपर्याकरणमेवालं पूर्णफल-लाभायेति विधानं विहितवान्। कामरूपपूर्णेच्छामात्रेण नियमेन भाव्यम्। कामं भिद्यते मिथः शक्तिः। न तावता फले वैषम्यम्। 'साधारण्यात्फलपरिणतेः'—फलपरिणतिः

सर्वेषां साधारणी, शक्तितारतम्यात् तत्तदनुष्ठितसाधनानां विषमत्वेऽपि असाधारण्येऽपि । 'सङ्कशः'—सर्वेषां सपर्याकरणे यौगपद्यम्। सङ्कशः—युगपत्, न अभ्यर्हितप्राथम्यादिक्रमेण बध्यमाना सपर्या अञ्जलिबन्धो भवेत् ।

"अञ्जलिः परमा मुद्रा क्षिप्रं देवप्रसादिनी ।"

'प्रथमाञ्जलिकिंकरो' भगवान्। 'मधुविजयिनस्त्वं च' मधुविजयी मधुहन्ता भगवान् मत्स्याश्वहंसावतारकृत् ।

"वेदोदन्वद्विभाजनविदो वंशजं विश्वमूर्तेः
आहुस्सिद्धाः कमलवसतेरौपवाह्यं भवन्तम्" ॥

इत्यत्रैव गीतं षष्ठश्लोके हंसमुद्दिश्य। मधुविजयी भगवान् तवैवसन्निकृष्टतरः । 'मधुविजयिन' इति हंसस्य संनिकर्षाधिक्यं व्यज्यते । हंसजातिर्भगवतः तव च साधारणी। 'त्वं च'—त्वया हंसेन । 'तौ युतावंजलिः' इति हस्तद्वयसंयोजनरूपांजलिबन्धनं न सुकरम्। यथाशक्ति यथेष्टं अंजलिबन्धसपर्यां त्वं च भावय। अयमेक एव पक्षि-हंसस्तत्रास्ते । आकाशे पतन्नास्ते । पतनावसरे गगनस्थो यथाशक्ति सपर्यां कुरु। "अत्र समासोक्त्या नित्यविभूतेरञ्जनाद्रितौल्यद्योतनादुपमालंकारो व्यज्यत इत्यलंकारेणा-लंकारध्वनिः" इति रसास्वादिनीप्रदर्शितो रसोऽनुभाव्यः । अंजनाद्रिरारुह्यते अञ्जनलेशलेपं विना निरंजनता संपद्यते। मनुजाः स्वर्गिभ्यो निर्विशेषा भवन्ति। परमपदादवतरन्ति सूरयः मनुजैस्तारतम्याभावेन संघीभवन्ति च। भगवत्सेवाजनिततदनुग्रहेण सर्वे समा भवन्ति ॥

पाण्डुच्छायोपवनवृतयः केतकैः सूचिभिन्नैः
नीडारम्भैर्गृहबलिभुजामाकुलग्रामचैत्याः ।
त्वय्यासन्ने परिणतफलश्यामजम्बूवनान्ताः
सम्पत्स्यन्ते कतिपयदिनस्थायिहंसा दशार्णाः ॥ मेघः २३

कान्ताविरहखिन्नः अतिमहत्कामुको यक्षः सन्देष्टा तत्र तत्र स्वप्रियाविरहावस्थासादृश्यं पश्यति । दूतमेघमपि आत्मवदतिमहत्कामुकं मन्यते । वक्ष्यति चानुपदमेव "फलमति-महत्कामुकत्वस्य लब्धा" इति । "माभूदेवं क्षणमपि च ते विद्युता विप्रयोगः" इति काव्यान्ते च आत्मवत्स्वदूतोऽपि कान्ताविरहेण समानशोक इति स्पष्टं कथयति। कान्ताविरहितो मेघः कान्ताविरहदुःखस्य दुस्सहतां जानीयात् । उभावपि कान्ताविधुरौ । समानशोकत्वं बन्धुत्वनिर्वर्तकम् ।

"आत्मानुमानात्पश्यामि निमग्नं शोकसागरे"

इति सुग्रीवं प्रति रामवचनं स्मर्तव्यम्। सुग्रीवभार्यापहारको वाली रावणतुल्योऽभवत्। 'पाण्डुच्छायोपवनवृतयः', पाण्डुच्छायत्वं विरहिलक्षणम्।

"पाण्डुच्छायातटरुहतरुभ्रंशिभिर्जीर्णपर्णैः
सौभाग्यं ते सुभग विरहावस्थया व्यंजयन्ती।"

इति मेघकान्तां सिन्धुनदीं वर्णयति। तत्र भ्रंशिभिर्जीर्णपर्णैः पाण्डुच्छायत्वमापाद्यते, अत्र उद्यद्भिः सूचिमात्रविकसितैः केतकीकुसुमैस्तदापाद्यते। कण्टकिविटपिनिर्मिता उपवनवृतयः। हृदयनिहितारंभकनायकसंयोगास्वादनेन विरहितनायिकायाः कण्टकितत्वम्। यद्यपि कामी अयं यक्षः, जनकतनयास्नानपुण्योदकेषु स्नानेन विग्रहवद्धर्मभूतरामाध्युषितरामगिर्याश्रमेषु वासेन चास्यमानसं देवताभक्तिप्रवणं सम्पन्नम्। अतश्चेश्वरायतनानि ईश्वरपूजां च पुनः पुनर्गायति। हंसकविना च पूर्वहंसे दिव्यक्षेत्राणि भूयो वर्ण्यन्ते। विग्रहवान् धर्मो रामस्तत्र सन्देष्टा। हंसश्च तत्र दूतः। 'नीडारंभैः,' काकाश्चटकाश्च ग्रामजनपूजितशिलाबद्धमूलेषु प्लक्षाश्वत्थादिवृक्षेषु वर्षारंभभिया स्वस्थिरवासाय नीडं निर्मातुमारभन्ते। ग्रामचैत्याः बलिभुग्भिः शब्दायमानैः इतस्ततः पतद्भिः काकादिपक्षिभिः चैत्यपूजार्थं मिलितैः ग्रामजनैश्च संकुलाः। 'त्वय्यासन्ने' महाभागस्य तवासत्तौ जम्बूवनानां भाग्यं परिणतं भवति जम्बूवृक्षाणां फलपरिणतेः। परिणतानि च जम्बूफलानि काकादीनां ग्रामजनानां चतुर्थपादे निर्दिश्यमानानां हंससन्यासिनामाषाढस्य प्रथमदिवसे चातुर्मास्याय ग्रामजननिर्मितेषु पर्णशालारूपनीडेषु कतिपयदिनानि स्थायितया वसतां च साधारणानि भोज्यानि। अयं च काव्याशयो व्यज्यते हंसकविना 'साधारण्यात्फल-परिणतेः' इति द्वाविंशश्लोके गायता। अत्र मेघश्लोके हंसाः कीर्त्यन्ते। 'आसन्ने' इत्यत्र त्रयोविंशे गीतमप्यनुस्मियत इव हंसत्रयोविंशे 'आसन्नानां वनविटपिनां' इति। 'संपत्स्यन्ते कतिपयदिनस्थायिहंसाः', मानससरोविहारिणोऽपि हंसाः दशार्णेषु कतिपयदिन-वासं रोचयन्ते। हंसवासेन च दशार्णानां भाग्यसंपत्तिः भाग्यस्य परिणतफलत्वम्। हंसाः इति तन्नामानः सन्यासिनोऽपि विवक्ष्यन्ते। नीडारंभैरिति तन्निवासार्थं श्रद्धालुभिर्ग्रामिमहाजनैः पर्णैः कुड्यनिर्माणारम्भोऽपि सूच्यत इव। ग्रामैकरात्राः सायंगृहाः ग्रामाद्ग्राममटन्तो नैकस्मिन् ग्रामे एकरात्रादधिकं वसेयुः। त्वयि मेघे आसन्ने आषाढप्रथमदिवसे हंसाः सन्यासिनोऽपि चातुर्मास्याय कतिपयदिनस्थिरवासं रोचयेरन्। वनान्तेषु वासनीडं रोचयेरन्। तद्वासभाग्येन जम्बूवनान्तानां परिणतफलभाग्यवत्त्वसम्पत्तिः। तद्वनवतां दशार्णानां च भाग्यसम्पत्तिः। "संपत्स्यन्ते नभसि भवतो राजहंसाः सहायाः" इति हंससमागमस्य भाग्यकरत्वं गीतम्।

तत्र प्रयुक्त एव 'संपत्स्यन्ते' शब्दः अत्रापि हंससमागमप्रस्तावे प्रयुज्यते । 'दशार्णाः' अर्णो जलं रसः । कथंचित् अनंगदशाः दश अपि सूच्यन्त इव । संभोगविप्रलंभावस्थाः भूयो वर्ण्यन्ते पूर्वमेघे विरहियक्षेण । उत्तरमेघश्लोकाः अवतार्यन्ते पूर्वमेघश्लोकैः भूयोविरहावस्थादिवर्णनैः । परिणतफलश्यामजम्बूवनान्ताः फलभरनम्रशिरोभिर्जम्बूवृक्षैराह्वयन्त इव हंसान् सन्यासिनः अत्र कतिपयदिनानि स्थायितया उषितव्यम्, तथा चास्मद्भाग्यं परिणतफलं भवेदिति वदन्तीव । 'भवन्ति नम्रास्तरवः फलोद्गमैः' । 'त्वन्निवासेच्छयेव' इति हंसत्रयोविंशश्लोकगीतमिदमपि व्यञ्जयतीव ॥

स्तोकोन्मग्नस्फुरितपुलिनां त्वन्निवासेच्छयेव
द्रक्ष्यस्याराद्कनकमुखरीं दक्षिणामंजनाद्रेः ।
आसन्नानां वनविटपिनां वीचिहस्तैः प्रसूना-
न्यर्चाहेतोरुपहरति या नूनमर्धेन्दुमौलेः ॥ हंसः २३

अंजनाद्रिर्वर्णितः । तस्य दक्षिणा नदी स्वर्णमुखी वर्ण्यते । नद्यो हंसानां पक्षिणां, हंसानां यतीनां च प्रियाः । अपररात्रेषु मुनयो नदीमवगाहन्ते । प्रत्यहं त्रिषवणमवगाहन्ते । "तस्यैवं विदुषो यज्ञस्य श्रद्धा पत्नी" । विदुषामात्मयाजिनां सन्यासिनामपि श्रद्धारूपपत्नी विहिता आत्मयज्ञाधिकाराय । नदीषु सन्यासिनां रतिर्न दोषाय, किन्तु गुणायैव । यथा 'स्रोतसामस्मि जाह्नवी' इति गीतजाह्नवीरूपविभूतिमति ब्रह्मणि रतिर्गुणायैव भवेत् । 'त्वन्निवासेच्छयेव स्तोकोन्मग्नस्फुरितपुलिनां' । त्वामाह्वयतीव नदी स्वर्णमुखी सुवर्णवाग्भिर्मुखरेव । 'स्तोकोन्मग्न'—नद्यपि स्तोकमुन्मज्जतीव उत्तिष्ठतीव त्वदाह्वानाय । तस्या उन्मज्जनरूपोत्थाने पूर्वं मग्नं तत्पुलिनमपि स्फुरति, व्यक्तीभवति । पुलिनस्फुरणं च स्तोकमेव —किञ्चिदेव । 'शनैश्शनै'रिति प्राचेतसगानम् । स्तोकोन्मज्जनं स्तोकस्फुरितपुलिनत्वं च सुवर्णमुख्याः । मातृभूताश्च गङ्गादिनद्यः सन्यासिनां लोकस्य च । मातुरुत्संगे डिंभस्य निवास इव । माता च स्वाङ्के स्वपुत्रस्योपवेशनमिच्छेत् । प्रेमगद्गदसुवर्णवाग्भिस्तमाह्वयेत् । हंसं पक्षिणमाह्वयतीवेयं नदी 'वत्स, मत्सैकते मदुत्संगे उपविश' इति । "सैकतलीनहंसमिथुना-स्रोतोवहा मालिनी" इत्यादिषु हंसानां नदीषु लीनोपवेशनप्रियत्वं प्रसिद्धम् । हंसाश्च नद्यभिमानिदेवताहृदयं रंजयन्ति । हंसाः सन्यासिनो भगवद्भक्ताः पावनतमाः पुण्यनदीरपि स्वसंपर्कात् पवित्रयन्ति । 'तीर्थीकुर्वन्ति तीर्थानि स्वान्तस्थेन गदाभृता', 'न ह्यम्मयानि तीर्थानि' इत्यादिकं स्मर्तव्यम् । सन्तीदमपि स्वर्णमुखीतीरे पवित्रपरमहंसाध्युषिताश्रमाः । विद्युत्स्फुरणमिव पुलिनस्फुरणं कामिनाम् । स्फुरितमिति तद्व्यंजनमपि ।

'ज्ञातास्वादो विवृतजघनां' इत्यादाविव नात्र विवृतशब्दप्रयोगः। स्वप्रियतमजनाय भगवान् तनूं स्वां विवृणोति। 'विवृणुते तनूं स्वां' इति गीयते मुण्डकोपनिषदि। 'आरात् द्रक्ष्यसि'—दूरादेव तदुत्कटेच्छां द्रक्ष्यसि। सुदूरे आगच्छन्तं भवन्तं दृष्ट्वा ईदृशः संभ्रमोऽस्या नद्याः। 'कनकमुखरीम्', कनकगिरिनिवासिनीश्वरे कनकमुखर्याः भक्तिर्युक्ता। 'अंजनाद्रेर्दक्षिणां'—अंजनाद्रिसम्बन्धिनीयं नदी अर्धेन्दुमौलेरर्चाहेतोः महत्या श्रद्धया प्रसूनान्युपहरतीत्यस्या दाक्षिण्यं नूनं विस्मयावहम्। दक्षिणा न केवलदक्षिणदिग्भागवर्तित्वेन, किन्तु दाक्षिण्यगुणवैशिष्ट्येनापि। 'परच्छन्दानुवर्तित्वं दाक्षिण्यम्'। दाक्षिण्यगुण एव समर्थ्यते उत्तरार्धे। 'आसन्नानां वनविटपिनां प्रसूनानि'—आसन्नाः नदीतीरवनकुसुमवृक्षाः नदीजलसेकेन संवर्ध्यन्ते। नद्या स्वर्णमुख्यैव संवर्धिताः कुसुमवृक्षाः। नद्या स्ववीचिहस्तैरेव सेचिता वृक्षाः। वीचिहस्तैः संवर्धिताः वनविटपिनः स्वहस्तभूतशाखाभिः मातृभूतनद्यां प्रसूनानि प्रक्षिपन्ति। नदी च तानि स्वहस्तैरर्धेन्दुमौलेरर्चाहेतोरुपहरति। स्वारामेषु स्वसेचितेभ्यः कुसुमतरुभ्योऽपचितानि प्रसूनानि उत्तमानीति निरूपितं रसास्वादिन्या। कनकमुखरी कनकसदृशोत्तमकल्पमेवानुतिष्ठेत्। 'विटपिनः' इति विटपैर्बाहुमत्वं व्यज्यते। 'कोमलविटपानुकारिणौ बाहू'। बाहुभूतविटपैः प्रसूनानि समर्पयन्ति। 'विटपिनः' इति परिकरांकुरः। पूजापरिकराः प्रच्याव्यन्ते नदीवीचिहस्तेषु भगवते उपहरणाय। 'अर्धेन्दुमौलेरर्चाहेतोः'—इन्दुमौलिकर्मकार्चाहेतोः। कर्मणि षष्ठी। अर्चायाः कर्मनिर्देशोऽवश्यापेक्षितः। नात्र अर्चाकर्म अन्यन्निर्दिष्टम्।

"स्तुवन्तः कं कमर्चन्तः प्राप्नुयुर्मानवाः शुभम्"

इति पृच्छ्यते युधिष्ठिरेण सहस्रनामार्चनावतरणाय। उपहरतीति क्रियापदं स्वसाक्षात्कर्तृकभगवत्पुष्पार्चने स्वरसम्।

'प्रातरुत्थाय चिन्वीयात् स्वारामात्स्वयमेव हि'

इति रसास्वादिन्युदाहृतं वचनमपि तमर्थं द्रढयति। 'अर्चाहेतोः'—"चन्द्रशेखरकर्मकस्वकर्तृकाराधनार्थं वा तादृशान्यकर्तृकाराधनार्थं वेत्यर्थः" इति रसास्वादिनी। 'यद्वा रुद्रकर्तृकभगवदाराधनार्थमित्यर्थः' इति चरममर्थान्तरं वर्णितं तया। 'अनुद्वेगकरं वाक्यं' इति भगवान् सात्त्विकवाक्यं लक्षयति। "यस्मान्नोद्विजते लोकः" इति मुमुक्षुभक्तलक्षणं गीतम्। "यत्नोद्वेगो न धीमताम्" इति काव्यरचनायां कस्यापि धीमतः उद्वेगलेशापादनाभावनियमादरणं निर्बध्यते। परमहंसपरिव्राजकाचार्याणां रसास्वादिनीनिबन्धॄणां तटस्थता, काव्यनियमादरणं, रसपारवश्यञ्च भूयः सम्भन्तव्यानि। दुर्लभास्तादृशाः॥

వినోదవిమర్శము

శ్రీ వేటూరి - ప్రభాకరశాస్త్రి.

నన్నయ తిక్కన, నన్నిచోడకవుల రచనలలో కొన్ని పద్యములఁగూర్చి :—

అక్షరరమ్యత, శయ్యాసౌభాగ్యము, ప్రసన్న కథా కలితార్థయుక్తి నన్నయ రచనలోఁ గుదుర్కొన్నవి. ఎంతలోఁతైన భావమునయినను నాతఁ డక్షరరమ్యతగల తన ప్రసన్నకవితలోఁ బ్రవ్యక్తముగా సుగోచరమగునట్లు చేయఁ గలిగినాఁడు. గ్రంథగ్రంథులు నన్నయరచనలో నుండవు. నన్నయ శయ్యవంటి పురాణశయ్య కావ్యగౌరవముకలది, భాగవతకర్త కొక్కనికే తక్క మఱి యితరపురాణయుగాంధ్రకవుల కెవ్వరికిని దక్కలేదు. ఇందుకుఁ దార్కాణగా రెండు మూఁడు పద్యములు.

రాజసూయ మహాధ్వరము జరుగునపుడు భీష్ముఁడు ధర్మరాజుతో 'నఖిలలోక పూజ్యు నచ్యుతుఁ బూజింపు' మనఁగా శిశుపాలుఁ డుపాలంభన పరుండయి యధోక్షజు నాక్షేపించుచు ధర్మరాజునకిట్లనుచున్నాఁడు.

అవనీనాథు లనేకులుండఁగ విశిష్టాచార్యు లార్యుల్ మహీ
దివిజుల్ పూజ్యులు పల్వురుండఁగ ధరిత్రీనాథ ! గాంగేయదు
ర్వ్యవసాయంబునఁ గృష్ణుఁ గష్టచరితున్ వార్ష్ణేయుఁ బూజించి నీ
యవివేకం బెఱిఁగించి తిందఱకు దాశార్హుండు పూజార్హుఁడే.

ఈ పద్యమున ననుప్రాసము, నక్షరసౌభాగ్యము, శయ్యాయొయ్యారమును మాత్రమే కాక దా శార్హుఁడు=పల్లెలు బోయలు మొదలగువారికిఁ దగినవాఁడు, వారిలో విహరింపఁ దగినవాఁడు లేక భృత్యతను, నౌకరీకి తగినవాఁడు, శ్రీకృష్ణుఁడు పూజార్హుఁడగునా ? యనియు నాక్షేపము. దాశార్హ పదము నకు రెండర్థము లున్నవి. పల్లెకారీలకుఁ దగినవాఁడనియు, నౌకరీకిఁ దగిన వాఁడనియుఁ జెడ్డయర్థము. దశార్ణదేశభవుఁడని మంచి యర్థము.

ఇతనికిఁ గూర్తురేని ధనమిత్తు రభీష్టములైన కార్యముల్
మతి నొనరింతు రిష్టుఁడని మంతురు గాక మహాత్ములైన భూ
పతులయు విప్రముఖ్యులసభన్ విధిదృష్ట విశిష్టపూజనా
యతికి ననర్హు నర్హుఁడని యచ్యుతు నర్చితుఁ జేయఁబాడియే.

ఇక్కడ ధర్మరాజుతో భీష్ముఁడు అచ్యుతుఁబూజింపు మనునప్పు డుపయోగించిన యచ్యుతపదమునే శిశుపాలుఁడు వెక్కిరింపుగా నర్థాంతరమునఁ బునః ప్రయోగముచేసి నట్లు నన్నయభట్టు రచించి గంభీరభావము గల్పించి నాఁడు. అతఁడు నిధిదృష్టవిశిష్ట పూజనాయతికి ననర్హుఁడు. ఇట్టి యా చ్యుతుని నర్చితుని జేయుట పాడిగాదు అని శిశుపాలుని భావము. భీష్ముని పలుకులలోని యచ్యుత పదమునకు అచ్యుతుఁడు అని యర్థాంతరము గలుగుట ప్రాచీనవ్యాకరణ సంప్రదాయసమ్మతము. ఈ పద్యమునఁగూడ నక్షరరమ్యత, యనుప్రాస చమత్కృతి, ద్వైవాటియున్నవి. ఈ శిశుపాల కథాఘట్టమెల్ల శబ్దార్థగాంభీర్య కలితమై రసోత్తరమై యున్నది.

అవమాన్యుక్ సభలోన మాన్యుఁడని సౌహార్దంబునం గౌరవ
స్థవిరప్రేరణ నిన్నుఁ బాండుతనయుల్ తప్పంగఁ బూజించి ర
య్యవివేకాస్పదులైన పాండవులు మోహాంధుండు భీష్ముండుఁ గే
శవ ! నీవుం గడగుండు నాకునెదురై సంగ్రామరంగంబునన్

ఇందు నాల్గవచరణమున ' కే ' యని కేక, ' శవ నీవుం గడగుండు ' అని నింద. ఇట్టి చోట్లనెల్లఁ బలుకుబడిలోనే యర్థ విశేషములు పదచ్ఛేదభేదముచేఁ గల్పించి గంభీర భావభేదములకు ఝుడితిస్ఫూర్తి గూర్చుట నన్నయనైపుణ్యము. కారకాన్వయ కౌటిల్యముతో నర్థవిశేషములను సాధించుట నన్నయ తీరుకాదు.

తిక్కన—

తిక్కన స్వయము కవీశ్వరుఁడగుటే కాక పలువురుకవులతో సరసకవితా వినోదములు కూడ జరిపినాఁడు. తన యాస్థానిలో నొక కవీశ్వరునికి సమస్య నిచ్చినాఁడట !

ఆకులు పోకలుంగలిగె నంతియచాలును సున్న మేటికిన్.

ఆ కవి యిట్లు పూరించినాఁడు.

శ్రీకరమూర్తి హారిగుణశేఖర కొమ్మయమంత్రి తిక్క ! నీ
రాకలుగోరు ముగ్ధ కనురాగమునన్ బెనుమన్మథాగ్నిచేఁ
బ్రాకటమైన ముత్తెములు భస్మములైనవి, వేగరావనా !
యాకులుఁ బోకలుం గలిగె నంతియచాలును సున్నమేటికిన్.

నన్నయ సంస్కృత పదబాహుళ్యమై, ప్రసన్నార్థమయి, సర్వసులభమైన రచనమును చేయఁగాఁ దిక్కన దేశిపలుకుల మెలపులతోఁ గవితామర్మములతో సంస్కృతమున వ్యాసుఁడు చొప్పించినట్లు పెక్కుచోట్ల గ్రంథగ్రంథులను చేర్చి చొప్పించి తనగ్రంథమును ప్రౌఢరసికాంధ్ర పండితైకవేద్యముగా దివ్య కావ్య శయ్యతో నిర్వహించినాఁడు. తిక్కన గ్రంథగ్రంథులను గొన్నిటిని జూపుచున్నాను.

'గురుని మాట సరకు గొనమి దుశ్శీలత
పిట్టఁ బుడుక గోరుఁ బిసుకఁ ద్రుంపఁ
గరవ మరుగు టుదయ కాలాస్తమయ సమ
యముల భానుఁ జూచు టాయువడఁచు.'

ఈ పద్యమునఁ గవితామర్మమున్నది. క్రొత్తవారీపద్యము నర్థమును గుర్తింపఁజాలరు. వృద్ధ విద్వాంసుల మూలముననో, సంస్కృతమూలము మూలముననో గుర్తింపవలసినది దీనియర్థము. 'లోష్టమర్దీ తృణచ్ఛేదీ నఖఖాదీ చ యో నరః' అనుమూలమున కిది తెనుఁగు. పిట్ట, పుడుక, గోరు అనగా లోష్టము, తృణము, నఖము అనువానిని పిసుకుటకును, త్రుంపుటకును, కఱచుటకును అలవాటు పడుట ఆయువును హరించునని యర్థము. తిక్కన దీనిని 'బెడ్డ చిదుప, పుడుక విరువ, గోరుగరవ, మరుగుటుదయ' అని సులువుగాఁ గూర్ప వచ్చును. అయినను నిండు యథాసంఖ్యాలంకారము చేర్చి పిట్ట పుడుక గోరు అనుచోఁబిట్టను బట్టుకొనగోరునట్టి యని యనన్వితార్థాభాసచిత్రమును గల్పించి పాఠకులను లోఁతు యోచనకుఁ బాల్పఱచినాఁడు. మఱియు,

అనిన నలుగాలివాన గోవును నశేష
శబ్దముల మంత్రమును లోహజాతిఁ గాంచ
నమును మనుజుల విప్రుండు సమధికత్వ
భాజనము లండ్రు వేదప్రపంచవిదులు.

తెలుఁగు కూర్పుమఱుఁగు తెలియఁగనివారైనచోఁ బ్రౌఢ సంస్కృత పండితులు సైతము ఈ పద్యమున నలుఁడేమిటి? గాలివాన యేమిటి? అనన్వితముగానున్నవే యని యంగలార్తురు. తిక్కన యిక్కడఁ జతుష్పాత్తులనికాని, నాలుగుకాళ్ల జంతువులని కాని సులువుగా ననలేఁడా? అనఁగలఁడు కాని

నలుఁడు గాలివాన అన్న ప్రసిద్ధ పదముల ఝడితిస్ఫూర్తి కలిగి పాఠకుల కనన్వయము తోఁచి లోఁతైన యోచనతో తదాభాసచిత్రము గోచరించునట్లు కవితామర్మ మిక్కడఁ గల్పించినాఁడు.

సంస్కృత భాగవతమును బలుతూరులు పురాణము చెప్పిన యొక ప్రౌఢ సంస్కృతపండితుఁడు ఆంధ్ర భాగవతమును గూడఁ బురాణము చెప్పుచు 'ఓదముత్రవ్వి జీవనపుటోలమునంబడి' అన్న పోతన్న పద్యమున కర్థము చెప్పఁ గఁదురక యిక్కడఁ బుటోల శబ్దమునకర్థము తెలియలేదు. సంస్కృతాంధ్ర నిఘంటువులలోఁ బటోలపదమున్నదికాని పుటోలపదములేదు. ఇందేదో తప్పున్నది అని చెప్పెనట! తెలుఁగు మఱుఁగులెఱిఁగిన సహృదయుఁ డొకఁడు మదపుటేనుఁగు వంటిదీపదము. మదము, ఏనుఁగు సమసించినట్లు జీవనము, ఓలము అను పదములు సమసించినవి. ఓలమనఁగా నర్థమిదియనిచెప్పి యా సంస్కృత పండితునకు సహాయపడెనట! ఇది యెనుబది యేండ్లక్రిందట నిజముగా జరిగిన కథ! మానాయనగారు చెప్పఁగా విన్నాను.

విరాటోద్యోగ పర్వములలోఁ దిక్కనకవితామర్మములు మఱీ ఉన్నవి.

నీతలపేను గంటి నొకనేర్పున శౌరికి లంచమిచ్చి సం
ప్రీతునిజేసి కార్యగతి భేదము సేయఁగఁ జూచె, దింత బే
లైతిగదే సుమేరు సదృశార్థముఁ జూచియుఁబార్థుఁ బాయునే
యాతఁడు క్రీడి భక్తియును నచ్యుతుపెంపును నీవెఱుంగవే.

శ్రీకృష్ణుఁడు రాయబారము వచ్చినపుడు విదురుఁడు ధృతరాష్ట్రునితో సంభాషించు సందర్భములోని పద్యమిది. ఇచ్చట నీతలఁపును నేనెఱుఁగుదును. అను ముఖ్యార్థమేకాక అది నీతలలోని పేనువంటిదిసుమా! అను నర్థాంతరము కూడనున్నది. ఇక్కడఁ దిక్కన యెఱిఁగియే తలపేను శబ్ద చిత్రమునుగూర్చినాఁడు. ఇటువంటి శబ్దార్థ చిత్రములను దిక్కన్న రచనమున నెన్నింటినేని లెక్కింపవచ్చును. నిరుడు నెల్లూరు తిక్కన వర్ధంతిసభలోఁ దిక్కన రచనా విశేషములగూర్చి చర్చజరిగినట్లు పత్రికలలోఁ జదివితిని. విరాట ద్వితీయాశ్వాసమున సైరంధ్రినిగూర్చి కీచకుని ప్రలాపములలోఁ దిక్కన యశ్లీలార్థ దూషితముగా 'దీనిఁబొందఁగాంచు తెఱఁగునాకెయ్యది యొక్కొ' అని కూర్చెననియు నది కీచక పాత్రోచితమని యొకరును, 'దీనిఁబొంద' యనుచో నశ్లీలార్థము పరిగణింప నక్కరలేదని మఱికొందఱు ననిరట! ఇప్పుడు ప్రచారములో

నున్న తిక్కన విరాటపర్వముద్రణము లానాడెంటలోఁ బారమిళ్లే ముద్రితమై యుండుటచే నీయనర్థము వచ్చినది. తిక్కన రచనమిట్లుండదు. ఈ పద్యము పై నాలుగు సీసచరణములందును దీని జన్మంబున, దీనివల్లభుఁడు, దీని నామాకృతి, దీని వసించుట యని సైరంధ్రీవాచక సర్వనామము షష్ఠీసమాసగతమైయుండఁ గూర్చి గీతిలో మాత్రము 'దీనిఁబొంద' అని వ్యస్తముగా, నపక్రమముగా, నశ్లీల స్ఫోరకముగా దిక్కన కూర్చడు. కాన యిక్కడఁగూడ 'దీనిపొందుఁ గాంచు తెఱఁగునాకెయ్యది యొక్కొ' అనియేయుండవలెను. విరాట పర్వ ముద్రాపకు లెల్లరును "దీనిఁబొంద" యనియే గ్రహించుట యనుశోచనీయము. తిక్కనబొందను బ్రయోగింపలేదు. లేఖకులు, ముద్రాపకులు ప్రమాదపుబొందఁ బడిరి. విరాటపర్వ ద్వితీయాశ్వాసముననే తిక్కన కవితా మర్మములును, పదలాలిత్యములును, గమసరికూర్పునేర్పులును నెన్నో యప్రౌఢులైన లేఖక పాఠకముద్రాపకుల మూలమునఁ దార్మారై కానవచ్చినవి. దేసి తెలుఁగు మఱుఁగులెఱింగిన ప్రౌఢాంధ్ర పండితులుగాని గుర్తింపరానివగుటచే ననేకపాఠములు తిక్కన రచనలో నట్లు తార్మారైనవి.

సీ॥ తన్వంగి మవ్వంపుఁ దనులత నెసగెడు
నునుగాంతి వెల్లువ మునుఁగఁ బాఱఁ
గిసలయహస్తకెంగేల నేపారుక్రొ
మ్మిం చనులేయెండ మిగులఁ బర్వఁ
కమలాస్య ముద్దుమొగంబు లేమెఱుఁగుల
మొత్తంబుపరి చుట్టు ముట్టికొనఁగ
ధవళాక్షి తొంగలి తఱచు ఱెప్పల చెన్ను
కప్పనుచీకటి గవియుదేర

గీ॥ బెగ్గలం బంతకంతకు నగ్గలించి,
యొదవి చెమ్మట, చిత్తంబు సెదరి, యొందు
మెలగఁ దలఁపేది, యాసింహబలుఁడనంగు
పట్టియాడెడు జంత్రంబుపగిది నుండె.

ఈ పద్యమునెత్తు గీతియందుగల యసమాపక క్రియలనాల్గింటిని, సీసపు నాలుగు పాదములకు యథాసంఖ్యముగాఁ గూర్చుకొని యర్థమెఱుఁగఁదగును. కాంతి వెల్లువ కీచకుఁడు మునుఁగునట్లు ప్రవహింపగాఁ వానికి బెగ్గలమంతకంతకు

నగ్గలమైనది. లేయెండ మిగులఁ బర్వఁగాఁ వానికిజెమ్మటయొదవినది. లేమెఱుఁగుల మొత్తమను సైన్యము చుట్టుముట్టఁకొనఁగాఁ జిత్తము సెదరినది. కనుఱెప్పల కప్పను చీకటి క్రమ్ముకొనఁగా నెందును మెలఁగలేక పోయినాఁడు. ఇందు, ఎత్తుగీతి పైయర్థమున కనుగుణముగా ముద్రణములందుఁగానరాదు. మఱియు నింకొకపద్యమున,

> ' కేలిమై నొక్కట లీలఁ గ్రేళ్లుఱికెడు
> వాలుగుసోగల నేలుదెంచి ' అనియున్నది

ఏలుదెంచియనుట తిక్కనప్రయోగముకాదు. ఏఁగుదెంచు, చనుదెంచు, పుత్తెంచు, తోతెంచు ఇత్యాదిగా గత్యర్థసంబంధములగు ధాతువులమీఁదనే ' తెంచు ' ధాతు వనుప్రయుక్తమగుట భాషలోఁగానవచ్చును. తక్కిన మూఁడు చరణములలోను తెగడి, తూలంద్రోలి, ఉక్కడంచి యున్నవి గనుక యిక్కడఁగూడఁ దదనుగుణముగా ' నేలిదించి ' యని యుండఁదగును. ఎల్లిదించు, రూపాంతరము ఏలిదించు. అవహేళనము చేసి యని యర్థము. ఇంకొకటి,

> సీ॥ సమదవారణము జంగమలత వెనుకొని
> సరభసంబునఁ బట్టఁ జనువిధమున
> గ్రూరదానవుఁడు భూచారి నిర్జరకాంతఁ
> బొదువ రయమ్మునఁ బోవుభంగి
> ఘోరగృధ్రము సుకుమార నాగాంగనఁ
> బటుగతి నొడియంగఁ బాఱుకరణిఁ
> బ్రబలబిడాలంబు బాలశారికమీఁద
> నడరి సత్వరమున నరుగుమాడ్కి.
>
> గీ॥ సింహబలుఁ డత్యుదగ్రతఁ జిగురుబోఁడి
> పజ్జఁ గడువడిఁ దగిలి కోపంబు గదుర
> నొడిచి తలవట్టి తిగిచి మహోగ్రవృత్తిఁ
> గొంతు కొసరించుకయు లేక కూలఁదాఁచె.

ఈ పద్యమున ద్రౌపది కుపమానములుగా మూఁడు చరణములలో జంగమలత, భూచారి నిర్జరకాంత, సుకుమార నాగాంగన యనునవి భూలోక దుర్లభములున్నవి. నాల్గవ చరణమునఁగూడ నట్లేకదా యుండవలెను.

మఱియు మూఁడు చరణములలోను ద్రౌపద్యుపమాన పదములు ద్వితీయాంత ములుగా నున్నవి. నాల్గవచరణమునఁగూడ నట్లేకదాయుండవలెను. ఈ తీరునఁ జూడఁగా

'ప్రబల బిడాలంబు భారతీ శారిక

నడఁప సత్వరమున నరుగుమాడ్కి' అని యుండుట బాగు.

"ఈభారతీశారిక" పదము "భారతీదేవిముంజేతి పలుకుఁజిలుక" వంటిది.

కీచకుఁడు ద్రౌపదిఁగూర్చి చేయు నసందర్భాలాపములలో నీక్రిందిది యొకటి.

చిత్తము మెచ్చినావలనఁజిక్కఁగ వెండియునాలతాంగి య
చ్చొత్తినయట్లు నాకుఁదనయుల్లము తెల్లముసేయకున్కి దా
నత్తఱిఁ గ్రొత్తకాన్పగుట నడ్డము సొచ్చిన సిగ్గు పెంపు న
న్నుత్తలమందఁ జేయుటకునో తలపోసి యెఱుంగనయ్యెదన్.

ముద్రణములో నీపద్యమిట్లున్నది. తిక్కన పలుకుబడిగాని, యర్థపుసొంపు గాని యిందుఁ బొందుపడకున్నది. ఇది యిట్లుండఁగాఁదగునని నాతలంపు.

చిత్తముమెచ్చి నావలనఁ జిక్కఁగ వెండియు నాలతాంగి య
చ్చొత్తినయట్లు నాకుఁదనయుల్లము తెల్లముసేయకున్కిదా
నత్తఱిఁగ్రొత్తకాన్పగుట నడ్డము సొచ్చిన సిగ్గుపెంపొ ? న
న్నుత్తలమందఁ జేయుటగునో ? తలపోసి యెఱుంగనయ్యెదన్.

రాయబార మరుగునప్పుడు కృష్ణునితో ద్రౌపది తనభంగపాటును జెప్పు పలుకులలో,

అంతలుసేసి పోనడిచి యక్కట సంజయుచేతఁ జెప్పి పు
త్తెంతురె ? యిట్టి యూఱటమదిం బ్రియమందె యుధిష్ఠిరుండు. దా
నంతన యూళ్ళు లేవురకునైదు సుయోధనుఁడిచ్చు నొక్కొ ? ఈ
కంతకృపావిహీనమతి నాతఁడు నేచునె యన్నదమ్ములన్.

ఇందు 'ఈకంత' అనుచోఁ గొందఱు వికటార్థములనుగూడఁజెప్పుదురు. ఇక్కడ 'ఒక్కంత కృపావిహీనమతి నాతఁడు నేచునె యన్నదమ్ములన్' అన్న పాఠము సుందరము. ఇంతవఱకు నేనిప్పుడు వెల్లడించిన సంస్కరణ ములలోనిది యొక్కటి తక్కఁదక్కిన వెల్లను తిక్కన హృదయము నూహించి

నేనే చేసినవికాని వ్రాతప్రతులఁజూచి చేసినవికావు. ఈ తీరునఁజూడఁగా దేసి తెలుఁగు మఱుఁగులలో సాటిలేని నేర్పుతో మెలగనేర్చిన తిక్కన సారస్వత భాండారమగు భారత భాగమును సరిగా నుపయోగించుకొనుటకు సమర్థమైన సహృదయ పండితగోష్ఠి జరగవలెను. ఇట్టి పరిశీలనము జరుగని-చోఁ దిక్కన పద ప్రయోగ లాలిత్యము సరిగాఁ బరిజ్ఞాతము కాఁజాలదు.

తిక్కన రచనలో నింకొక వింతతీరు కూర్పును వివరించుచున్నాను. ఆంధ్ర కవితారచనమున వాక్యముల నసమాపకములుగా పద్యమునుండి పద్యమునకు సాగునట్లు కూర్చుటకలదు. అనఁగా నొక వాక్యము రెండు భిన్న పద్యములలో ననుగతమై యుండునన్నమాట. పద్యావసానమునకుఁ బద్యోపక్రమమునకు నడుమఁ గొంతవిశ్రాంతి యుండును. ఒక వాక్యముచ్చరించునపుడుగూడ నడుమ విశ్రాంతి యుండఁదగును గనుక ఆకూర్పు అసందర్భముగాఁదోపదు. కాని రెండు భిన్నజాతివియగు పద్యములలో నొక సమాస పదమునే సంధించి కూర్చుట చాల విడ్డూరముగా నుండును. ద్విపదములు, రగడలు, మొదలగువానిలోను, మాలికా వృత్తములలోను నాల్గు చరణములకుఁ బద్యము ముగియదు కాన వానిలోనట్లుండవచ్చునుగాక, భిన్నజాతిపద్యముల యవసానారంభములలోనే ప్రధానముగా సంహిత పాటింపవలసిన సమాస పదము, తిక్కన రచనలోనున్నది.

ఒకటి యడిగెదఁ గృప చిగురొత్తఁ జెప్పు
వలయు మీరు మాయింటికి వచ్చియొక్క
ప్రక్కక్రిందుగ నిరువదియొక్క దినము
లనఘ ! నిద్రించి తదిమొదలైన నీదు—

క॥ చరితం బద్భుతము మునీ
శ్వర ! దీనికిఁ గారణము విచారమున కగో
చరమెఱిఁగింపు మనుడు నా
ధరణీవల్లభునితో నతం డిట్లనియెన్.

'నీదు-చరితము' అన్న సమాసపదము రెండు భిన్నజాతిపద్యముల యంతాదులలోనున్నది. నన్నిచోడ మహాకవికూడ నిట్లొకచోఁ బ్రయోగించినాఁడు. నన్నిచోడకవి పద్యములు కొన్ని:—

గీ॥ రవి పదాహతిఁ జెడియుండు రాజువోలె
వని సరోజములొందఁ జక్రాహ్వయములఁ
జెట్ట లాడుటకని వికసిల్లుటకును
వెల్లనైనట్లు చుక్కలు వెలరువాఱె.

నన్ని - కుమా. ౮ అ.

ముద్రణకై దిద్దవలెను. అర్థము కుదురక గ్రుడ్లుమిటకరించి కొట్టుకొని యెట్టకేల కిట్టు కవిపాఠము కనిపెట్టఁగలిగినాను.

గీ॥ రవిపదాహతిఁ జెడి యుడురాజు వోయె
వని సరోజములొద్దఁ జక్రాహ్వయములు
చెట్టలాడుట, కవి వికసిల్లుటకును,
వెల్లనైనట్లు చుక్కలు వెలరువాఱె.

ఉడురాజు=నక్షత్రాధిపతి, చంద్రుఁడు. ఉడిగిపోవు, ముగిసిపోవురాజు అనికూడ; ఉడుఁబోతపిండె వంటిది. విరోధియైన యుడురాజు పడిపోవుట నాకసమున కెగసి చక్రవాకపక్షులుచూచి యా సంతోషవార్తను మిత్రములైన సరోజముల యొద్దికివచ్చి, చెట్టలాడుటకును=పడిపోయిన జంద్రుని నిందించుట కును, మఱియు నుత్సాహముతో ఱెక్కలల్లాడు(ర్చు)టకును ననియు. అవి= మిత్రములయిన యాసరోజములు, వికసిల్లుటకును = వాని చెట్టలాటకుప్పొంగుట కును, వికాసము చెందుటకును, నవమానము చెంది తెల్లపోయినట్లు చంద్రుని మిత్రములైన నక్షత్రములు కాంతి హీనములై వెలవెలఁ బోయినవి.

కవిహృదయము పైయట్లు గోచరింపఁగా నాకవి నాకుఁ గనకాభిషేకము చేసినాఁ డన్నంత సంతోషమునఁ దోఁగినాఁడను. మఱికొన్ని ;

ఆయవనీరుహోద్గతలతాంతఃనిర్గత సౌరభప్రవా
హాయతసాంద్రమై ఫలితమై యొగిఁబర్విన డాయఁబోవనుం
బాయను రాకచుట్ట మధుపవ్రజమాలికలుండె నొప్పిపు
ష్పాయుధుకాలఁజుట్టు మరుఁడాయన వప్రము వెట్టినట్టిదై.

నవమాశ్వాసము 298 ప.

దీనికి నా సంస్కరణము.

ఆయవనీరుహోద్గతలతాంత వినిర్గత సౌరభప్రవా
హాయతి సాంద్రమై ఫలితమై మొగిఁబర్విన డాయఁబోవనుం

ఛాయను రాక చుట్టి మధుపవ్రజమాలికలుండె నొప్పి పు
ష్పాయుధుశాలచుట్టు మధుఁ డాయసనప్రమము వెట్టినట్టులై.

పుష్పాయుధశాల కధికారియైన వసంతుఁ డాయాయుధశాలలోని కెవరికిని రాకపోకల వీలులేకుండుటకు చుట్టును వినుపకోట పెట్టినట్లు భృంగమాలికలు పూలచెట్లను జుట్టియున్నవి. పూచినచెట్లు పుష్పాయుధశాలలు. మధుఁడు తదధినేత. ఇందులోఁ బుష్పాయుధుశాల, మరుఁడు ఉండుట యసంగతము.

సుజనజనైక భూషణము శూరత దుర్జన దూషణంబు స
ద్విజ విబుధాశ్రితప్రతతి వేడుకఁ బ్రోపును రాజ్యచిహ్నగా
క జలమహాభిషేకమునఁ గట్టిన పట్టము వీజనంబు భూ
భుజులక కాక యిన్నియును బుట్టికినైనను లేవె చూడఁగన్.

దీనికి నా సంస్కరణము.

సుజనజనైక భూషణము శూరత దుర్జనదూషణంబు స
ద్విజ విబుధాశ్రితప్రతతి వేడుకఁ బ్రోపును రాజ్యచిహ్నగా
క జలమహాభిషేకమునఁ గట్టిన పట్టము వీజనంబు భూ
భుజులక కాక యిన్నియును బుంటికినైనను లేవెచూడఁగన్.

వసధినీ కెల్లఁగొనిపోవఁగని సహింప
కద్బతతి గిట్టపట్టిన నరుగ నోప
కోలి దొంతులు గొనిపడియున్నకారు
మొగుళులనఁ జూచి తటభూమి మొగళులమరె.

(౧. ఆ. ౧౨౦ ప.)

దీనికి నా సంస్కరణము.

వసధినీ రల్లఁ గొనిపోవఁ గని సహింప
కబ్ధితటి గిట్ట పట్టిన నరుగ నోప
కోలి దొంతులు గొనిపడియున్న కారు
మొగుళులనఁ బూచి తటభూమి మొగళు లమరె.

అబ్ధికిఁ జుట్టు నబ్ధితటి కాపలా కాయుచున్నట్లును సముద్రములోని నీటిని మెల్లఁగాఁ బైపైకి మేఘము లెత్తుకొనిపోవుటకు జూచి యా యబ్ధితటి యా మేఘముల గిట్టలను (వానకాళ్లను) బట్టి యీడ్చి క్రిందఁ బడవేయఁగా నవి దొంతులు గొనిపడియున్న వన్నట్లును సముద్రతటమున మొగలి చెట్లున్నవి. ఆ మేఘములలోని మెఱుపులా యనునట్లు మొగలి పూవులున్నవి.

తనువసితాంబుదంబు సితదంతయుగం బచిరాంశు లాత్మగ
ర్జన మురు గర్జనంబు గరసద్రుచి శక్రశరాస నంబునై
చన మదవారివృష్టి హితసస్య సమృద్ధిగ నభ్రనేల నాఁ
జను గణనాథుఁ గొల్తు ననిశంబు నభీష్ట ఫలప్రదాతగాన్. (౧ ఆ. ౭ ప.)

దీనికి నా సంస్కరణము.

తనువసితాంబుదంబు సితదంతముఖం బచిరాంశు వాత్మగ
ర్జన మురుగర్జనంబు గరసద్రుచి శక్ర శరాస నంబునై
చన మదవారివృష్టి హితసస్య సమృద్ధిగ నభ్రవేళ నాఁ
జను గణనాథుఁ గొల్తు ననిశంబు నభీష్ట ఫలప్రదాతగాన్. (౧ అ. ౭ ప.)

విఘ్నేశ్వరుఁ డేకదంతుఁడు కాన సితదంతయుగంబని యుండరాదు. అచిరాంశువు=మెఱుపు అది ఉపమానముకాన యప్పుడప్పుడు మాత్రమే కన్పడు నదిగా నుండవలెను. సితదంతముఖంబనుటలో నోరు తెఱచినప్పుడగపడుట, మూసినప్పుడగపడకుండుట దంతాగ్రమునకు కలిగి యచిరాంశు సామ్యము సిద్ధించును.

ముదమున సత్కవి కావ్యము
నదరఁగ విలుకానిపట్టినమ్మును బరహృ
ద్భిదమై తలయూపింపని
యది కావ్యమె మలరి పట్టినదియును శరమే. (౧ ఆ. ౮౧ ప.)

వ్రాఁతప్రతిలో నీపద్య మిట్లున్నది.

మదమున......కావ్యము
నదరంగ విలుకాని పట్టినమ్మునుం బరహృ
ద్భిదమై తలయూపింప్పని
యదిగావ్యమె మరి పట్టినదియున్ శరమే.

దీనికి నా సంస్కరణము.

ముదమునఁ గవికృతి కావ్యము
నదరున విలుకాని పట్టినమ్ముఁను బరహృ
ద్భిదమై తలయూపును, బెఱ
యది కావ్యమె చెప్పఁ, బట్ట నదియు౯ శరమే,

ముదముతోఁ గవిరచించిన కావ్యమును- అదరుతో విలుకానిపట్టిన యమ్ముఁను ఒరుని హృదయ భేదనము గావించి తలయూపించును. అట్లుకాని-చో, రచించినంతమాత్రముచే నది కావ్యముకాదు. చేతఁబట్టినంతమాత్రముచే నది శరమునుగాదు. కావ్యమును, శరమును రెండును బరహృదయ భేదనముచేసి తల యూపించునవే కాని కావ్యము దానిని ముదముతోఁజేయును. బాణ మదరుతో జేయును. ముద్రితప్రతిలోని, వ్రాఁతప్రతిలోని పాఠములకు సర సాన్వయము కుదురలేదు.

జా నతి పశుపతి నుఱక వి
ధాన మహారంభుఁడైన దక్షుండను న
జ్ఞానికిమునుకొని వచ్చిన
మానంబన నమర సతివిమానము వచ్చె౯. (౨ అ. ౧౪౦ వ.)

దీనికి నా సంస్కరణము.

జా నతి పశుపతి నుఱక వి
తానమహారంభుఁడైన దక్షుండను న
జ్ఞానికి మునుకొని వచ్చెవి
మానంబన నమర సతివిమానము వచ్చె౯. (౨ ఆ. ౧౫౦ప.)

వైఖానససూత్రము, శాస్త్రము - వీని రచనాకాలము

ఆర్. పార్థసారథి అయ్యంగార్

వెనుకటివ్యాసమునందు వైఖానసశబ్దమునకు గల ప్రసిద్ధిప్రాచుర్యములను విస్తరించి చర్చించితిమి. ఆచర్చలో నిరూపింపబడిన సార మీవ్యాసమందు తరచు పరామర్శింపబడుటచే నద్దానిని జ్ఞాపకపరచుట ప్రస్తుతమై యున్నది.

వైఖానసశబ్ద మీక్రింది యర్థములందు ప్రయోగింపబడినది.

1. జగత్కారణమగు పరబ్రహ్మము.
2. త్రిమూర్తులలో నొక్కరుండగు చతుర్ముఖుడు.
3. కల్పసూత్రప్రణేతయగు నొక్క ఋషి.
4. వైఖానస కల్పసూత్రము.
5. ప్రజాపతినఖములందుత్పన్నమైనఋషిగణము. వీరు వాలఖిల్య సహచరితులు.
6. మంత్రద్రష్టలును ఇంద్రునకు ఇష్టులునగు నూర్వురు ఋషుల సమూహము.
7. పురుహన్ముడను నొక ఋషి.
8. వమ్రుడను నొక ఋషి.
9. ఒక్క సామవిశేషము.
10. వనస్థాశ్రమము.
11. వనస్థాశ్రమ ధర్మములు.
12. వనస్థాశ్రమనిష్ఠులు.
13. వైఖానససూత్ర సంస్కారములచే సంస్కరింపబడినవారు.
14. వైఖానస భగవచ్ఛాస్త్రము.
15. నక్షత్ర సమూహము.
16. శ్రామణకమను నొక యగ్నివిశేషము.
17. పశుహవిస్సును వండెడి పాత్రవిశేషము.
18. ఇష్టకా విశేషములు.

ఈ వ్యాసమందు పైయర్థములలో నొక్కటగు కల్పసూత్రముయొక్క కాలనిర్ణయమును చారిత్రకదృష్టిచే నిర్ణయించుటకు యత్నము చేయబడును.

ఈ యంశమున పాశ్చాత్యపరిశోధకులు వెలువరించిన యభిప్రాయములలో ముఖ్యమైనవాని నిచ్చట పొందుపరచుట యుచితమని తలచెదను.

ఐరోపాఖండమందలి హాలెండు దేశమున యూట్రెచ్చిసర్వకలాశాలలో సంస్కృతవిద్వాంసుడగు Dr. W. Caland శ్రీవైఖానసస్మార్త సూత్రమును ఆంగ్లమున తర్జుమాచేసి ప్రచురించిన 1930 సంవత్సరమువరకు పాశ్చాత్య పండితులలో చాలమందికి సూత్రమునుగురించి అతిస్వల్పముగ మాత్రమే తెలియునని చెప్పవచ్చును.*

---

* Of the literature belonging to the school of the Vaikhānasas the following works are, up to the present time, known to the Western scholars.

In 1910 the first half of the Vaikhānasa-Saṁhitā was published at Kumbakonam ; as it is printed in Grantha characters, it is inaccessible to great many scholars.

In 1913 the Dharmasūtra appeared in a rather uncritical edition as a volume of the Trivandrum series.

In 1914 the Gṛhyadharma and Pravara sūtras were printed at Kumbakonam, equally in Grantha characters ; the work is now out of print.

In 1915 a treatise elucidating a part of the Gṛhyasūtra and called Sūtra-darpaṇa appeared in Telugu characters at Kumbakonam.

In 1927 a critical edition of the Smārtha Sūtra (comprising the Gṛhya and the Dharma-sūtra) was issued in Devanāgarī characters by the Asiatic Society of Bengal.

Besides these printed works there was still accessible to Western scholars a copy of the Srauta Sūtra belonging to the collection Haug preserved in Munich. But this manuscript is of little value ; it is a bad copy of a Grantha original full of gaps, confused and bristling with faulty readings and clerical errors ; moreover it contains only a part of the whole.

This was all. (*On the Sacred Books of the Vaikhānasas*, page 1)

Albrecht Weber యీ వైఖానససూత్రము తైత్తిరీయ సూత్రము లారింటిలో నొక్కటియై యున్నదను నంశము సత్యాషాఢసూత్రవ్యాఖ్యాతయగు మహాదేవుని వైజయంతీవాక్యమువలన తెలియవచ్చుచున్నదని వ్రాసినాడు.[1]

Georg Buhler వైఖానససూత్రములు రెండు కలవనియు మొదటిది యీనాడు శిథిలమై ఒకప్పుడు మన్వాదులకాధారమై అతిప్రాచీనమై యుండెననియు రెండవదిప్పుడు లభ్యమై సూత్రాంతరముల కన్నిటికిని యర్వాచీనమైనదనియు చెప్పినాడు.[2]

---

1. Mahādeva, a commentator of the Kalpa Sūtra of Satyāṣāḍhe Hiraṇyakeśin, when enumerating the Taittirīya Sūtras in successive order in his introduction leaves out these four altogether and names at the head of his list the Sūtra of Baudhāyana as the oldest, then that of Bhāradvāja, next that of Apastamba, next that of Hiraṇyakeśin himself and finally two names not otherwise mentioned in this connection, Vādhūna and Vaikhānasa, the former of which is perhaps a corrupted form. (*History of Indian Literature*, page 100)

2. Another reference to a lost Sūtra occurs at Manu vi. 21 where it is said of the hermit in the forest ? or he may constantly subsist on flowers, roots and fruits alone............following the rules of the (institutes) of Vikhanas. The original Sanskrit of the particular clause is '*Vaikhānasamate sthitāḥ*' and means literally 'abiding by the Vaikhānasa opinion.' The commentators with the exception of Nārāyaṇa are unanimous in declaring that the word Vaikhānasa here denotes a Sāstra or Sūtra promulgated by Vikhanas in which the duties of hermits were described at length. The correctness of this opinion seems to me indisputable. For the word *Mata* 'opinion' in Manu's verse, requires that the preceding part of the compound should denote either a person or a school or a work. If we take Vaikhānasa in the sense of hermit in the forest, we obtain the meaningless translation 'a hermit may subsist on flowers etc. following the opinion of hermits.' It is therefore necessary to interpret Vaikhānasa with the commentators in the sense of Vaikhānasa Sāstra, and to refer to a particular work which taught the duties of hermits. The existence of such a work is attested not only by Manu's commentators, but also by ancient and modern authors. Baudhāyana mentions this explicitly and seems to give a short summary of its contents in the third chapter of the third pras'na of his Dharmasūtra. Haradatta the commentator of Apas-

Julius Jolly యీ విషయమును మరింత విస్తరించి వ్రాసియున్నాడు. సూత్రమందెచ్చటను నారాయణతత్త్వము విస్తరించి ప్రశంసింపబడుటచేతను, బుధవారముయొక్క నివేశముండుటచేతను, విధవాదహనమును గురించి ప్రశంసింపబడుటచేతను ఈ సూత్రము సాటిసూత్రములన్నిటిలో కడపటిది కాగలదనియు యభిప్రాయపడెను. ఈ సూత్రమందలి చాలమంత్రములు కేవలప్రతీకోపన్యాసము మాత్రమే చేయుటయుక్తమగుచుండగా నట్లు పఠియింపకపోవుటవలన వేదకాలమునకు చాల తరువాతి నిర్మాణములనియు నభిప్రాయపడెను. శ్రౌతసూత్రమప్పటికి ప్రచురింపబడనందున లభ్యమగు స్మార్తసూత్రమునకా శ్రౌతసూత్రము సాధారణమైనచో నీ సూత్రమునకు (ధర్మసూత్రమునకు) ధర్మసూత్రత్వము చెప్పదగు ననియు అనియున్నాడు.[1]

---

tamba and Gautama also appears to have known it. In his notes on Gautama III, 2 he gives the derivation of Vaikhānasa, a hermit in the forest, saying the Vānaprastha is called Vaikhānasa, because he lives according to the rule promulgated by Vikhanas, and adds 'for that (sage) chiefly taught that order.' If the statements made to me by Indian pandits are to be trusted, we may even hope to recover the work in course of time. It must be an exceedingly ancient book as the secondary meaning of Vaikhānasa, a hermit, which can have arisen only in the manner suggested by Haradatta, occurs in the oldest known Dharmasūtra. Under these circumstances it is not advisable to assume that it had any connection with the Vaikhānasa Sūtra *Carana*, a subdivision of the Taittirīyas which seems to have been one of the youngest off-shoots adhering to the Black Yajurveda. But it is evident that the ancient Vaikhānasa Sūtra, which treated of an important portion of the Sacred Law preceded our *Manusmṛti*. (S. B. E. 25 Introduction p. XXVII.)

1. Much more correct than the H. Ms. is Buhler's Ms. of the Vaikhānasa Sūtra in the Vienna University Library, consisting of a Gṛhya in 7 Praśnas and a Gṛhya Dharma in 4 Praśnas. The latter chiefly deals with the four Aśramas in which 4 kinds of Brahmacārins and Gṛhasthas respectively and 2 kinds of Vānaprasthas along with numerous subdivisions, have been distinguished (Pr. 1) and it also deals with the special religious duties of the Vanaprastha Snāna, Bhojana, Snātakadharma, the ways of life of the Vānaprastha and the Bhikṣu, mixed castes etc. (2, 3) and the pravaras (4). The law proper is not touched in this work which of course is

Dr. Bloch పండితుడు పై యంశములనన్నిటిని విస్తారముగ పరామర్శించి చాల వివరములను వ్రాసియున్నాడు. అందు ముఖ్యమైనవాని నీక్రింది విధముగ సంగ్రహింపవచ్చును.

---

a Gṛhya Dharma and not a Dharmasūtra ; the duties of the forest hermits, who as is well-known, are called Vaikhānasa after Vikhanas appearing in this work as an authority (*ity āha Vikhanāḥ*) are most exhaustively dealt with in this work. The term Vaikhānasa occurs already in Gaut. 3, 2 and Baudh. 2, 11, 14 and M. VI, 21 refer to the Vaikhānasa Sāstram or Matam when describing the duties of the forest hermit by which according to the commentators, is meant a sūtra work of Vikhanas about the duties of Vānaprastha. Has this work been preserved in our Ms.? The Srāmaṇakāgni or the establishment of the fire Srāmaṇakīyena Vidhānena, the exact time for retiring into the forest (Putram pautram ca dṛṣṭvā), distinction between the Sapatnīka who is accompanied by his wife, and the Apatnīka who goes alone into the forest (1—6, 8; 2 ff) and many other rules characteristic of our work are actually seen in the Smṛtis, while other things, such as the Phenapa, Audumbara, Kuṭīcaka and other kinds of hermits, may be, on the other hand, traced only in the Purāṇas or in the *Mah.* in the present state of our knowledge. The numerous passages connected with the cult of Nārāyaṇa appear to be very recent which like a red band stretches over the whole length of this sūtra work. Further the expression Budhavāra too occurs in it (Buhler). The allusion to widow-burning too in Vai. Gṛ. 7, 2 should be considered as a sign of its late origin; '*Sahamaraṇe daṁpatī dāhayati*,, if *sahamarṇa* here is not to be explained in any other way. The Vaikhānasa school is clearly considered as one of the youngest schools of the Black Yajurveda according to Mahādeva (WIL. 110). The connection of this work with this Veda is proved by the quotations of mantras from it and the reference to the Yajuḥ saṁhita. Many mantras however, a point emphasised to me by Dr. Caland, appear to be quite post Vedic and in the case of Yajus texts, mere pratīkas would have been sufficient. If this work forms the counterpart still unpublished Vaikhānasa Srauta Sūtra, it may be reckoned among the class of proper Dharmasūtras. As the prospect of the treatment of the whole Vaikhānasa Sūtra has been announced from a certain quarter, I shall not go deeper in this matter. (Julius Jolly—*Hindu Law and Customs* as translated by Bata Krishna Ghose, Calcutta 1928 pp. 18—20)

గ్రహశాంతిప్రకరణమందు సూత్రములో సూర్యాదిగ్రహములను చెప్పు నప్పుడు గ్రీకుదేశీయుల యుపపాదనాక్రమమనుసరింపబడినది.[1] వారములకు గ్రహములపేరులను వ్యవహరించుట హిందూదేశమందు క్రీస్తుశకము మూడవ శతాబ్ది మధ్యమందే ప్రవేశపెట్టబడియున్నది. కావున ఈ సూత్రము క్రీ. శ. మూడవ శతాబ్ది తరువాతిదై యుండవలెనని చెప్పుచున్నారు. ఈ యుపపాదకులు బోధాయనసూత్రమును ప్రాచీనమైనదానినిగా నిర్ణయింపుచు ఆ సూత్రము నందును నీగ్రహశాంతిప్రకరణమున పై గ్రీకుక్రమమే యనుసరింపబడుటను విమర్శించి యచ్చటి పాఠము తరువాతికాలమందు చేర్చబడినదై యుండునని నిర్వాహముచేసిరి. అట్లే వైఖానససూత్రమందలి పాఠముగూడ ప్రక్షిప్తమేల కాకూడదని శంకించుకొని యీ దోషముభయసాధారణమగుటంజేసి యుక్త్యంతరమును సాధింపయత్నించిరి.[2]

---

1. But our text contains two passages which show acquintance with the Greek order of the planets and the naming of the days of the week after them (which are) not introduced into India before the middle of the 3rd century of our Era. This is first of all, (cf. Jacobi Z. D. M. G. 30—305 ff.) the statement about the period fixed for the beginning of the school-session (Upākarma) which according to V. G. II, 12. fol. 17 b. falls in the bright half of the month of Aṣāḍha with the exception of the 4th, 9th and 14th days in which a tithi falling on a Wednesday is to be chosen ' Atha āṣāḍhe Upākarma kuryāt—āpūryamāṇāpakṣe, riktāparvaṇī varjayitvā, Budhavāre tithim gṛhṇāti : The second passage is found (in) V. G. IV 13, fol. 40 *b*, where the Grahaśānti is desciibed, a ceremony through which one aspires to avert the evil influences of the planets on the fate of man and where the nine planets are ennumerated in the Greek order.

   Adityaś Candro Āṅgarako Budho Bṛhaspatis tathā
   Sukraḥ Śanaiscaro Rahuḥ Ketus ceti nava grahāḥ.

   The same order then lies at the bottom of the whole section about these ceremonies. (V. G. IV, 13 and 14) Doctor Theodor Bloch—*Uber Das Gṛhya-und Dharma-sūtra der Vaikhānasa*, translated into English by Prof. P. V. Ramanujasvami, M.A.

2. If we are to be right in maintaining from this that both the passages in the V. G. also which contain a reference to the Greek order of planets are later interpolations, then we are obliged to prove right yet further conditions (Th. Bloch.)

ఈయుక్తికి మూలము వెనుకటి మహాదేవుని యుపపాదనమే. ఈప్రమాణమువలన వైఖానససూత్రము కొంత ప్రాచీనమని యొప్పుకొనినచో కొంత ప్రక్షిప్తమని చెప్పదగును గనుక నందు మూడవశతాబ్దికిముందు వ్రాయబడిన భాగమే లేదని సాధించిరి.[1] ఒకప్పుడు వైఖానసధర్మసూత్రములో చెప్పబడి ప్రాచీన సూత్రకారులచే ప్రమాణీకరింపబడిన ధర్మములేవైనను ఉన్నయెడల అయ్యవి దరిమిలా యెవరో యొక పురుషునిచే గృహ్యధర్మసూత్రములలోని ఇతర అధ్యాయములతో చేర్చబడినట్లుగా యెంచదగినవి. వైఖానసగృహ్యసూత్రమందలి II, III ప్రశ్నములు హిరణ్యకేశిసూత్రము ననుసరించి వ్రాయబడినట్లు నిశ్చితమగు ప్రమాణములు కలవనియు యభిప్రాయపడి ఆ విస్తరమును వ్రాసియున్నాడు.[1]

రెండు సూత్రములలోను సంస్కారములు ఉపనయనముతో నారంభించబడి చూడా కర్మతో ముగింపబడినవి. నాందీముఖము V. G. యందు విస్తరింపబడినది. ఉపనయనమునకు, యుక్తకాలము, మేఖలోపవీతాదులు, కేశవపనము రెండింటను చెప్పబడినవి. H. సూత్రమందు కేశవపనము సంగ్రహముగనే చెప్పబడినది. హిర-సూత్రమందు 'ఆతిష్ఠేమం' మంత్రముతో వటువుకు అశ్మారోహణమాచార్యునిచే జేయించబడగా V. G. యందు వటువు తన దక్షిణపాదాంగుష్ఠముచే స్పృశియించుట మాత్రమే చెప్పబడినది. వై. సూత్రమందు 'పరీదం' మంత్రముచే ఉత్తరీయమును ధరింపచేయుటయు హిర—సూత్రమందు ఆ మంత్రముచే నుత్తరీయధారణానంతరము బ్రహ్మచారిని సంబోధించుటయు చెప్పబడినది. V. G. యందలి యజ్ఞోపవీతమంత్రము పారస్కరసూత్ర (II, 2, 8, శంఖ II, 2, I) మందు క్తమైనది. శంఖస్మృతి యందు (II 2, 3) ఉపవీతధారణలక్షణము చెప్పబడినది. V. G. II, 6 లో

---

1. According to that well-known tradition preserved to us by Mahādeva, the commentator of the Kalpa Sūtra of Hiraṇyakeśin, Baudhāyana was the oldest in that series of Sūtakāras belonging to the Black Yajurveda, Bhāradvāja, Apastamba and Satyāṣāḍha-Hiraṇyakeśin belong later to him. We will have first of all to answer the question whether any parts of the V. G. and V. D. can possibly make pretentions to antiquity while other parts of the same work bear clear traces of a later time. (Th. Bloch)

వటువు హస్తాంగులులను పట్టుకొను మంత్రము H. I 5, 15 లో హస్తధారణమైన వెనుక ఆచార్యుడు వటువు దక్షిణకర్ణమందు జపించుటయందు ఆయుష్టే మంత్ర వినియోగమందు భేదమున్నది. ఇట్లే H. I 5, 8 ప్రకారము హస్తగ్రహణమందు వినియోగింపబడిన అగ్నిష్టే హస్తమంత్రము V. G. యందు హస్తవిసర్జనమున వినియోగింపబడినది. H. I. 6, 2 ప్రకారము యెడమ కర్ణమందు జపియించెడి మంత్రము V. G. యందు దక్షిణకర్ణమందు జపియించునదిగను యెడమచెవియందు జపియించుటకు మంత్రాంతరమును పఠింపబడినవి. భూర్భువస్త్వాది మంత్రములుభయసాధారణములుగ గానవచ్చుచున్నవి. గణానాం త్వా మంత్రము రెండు సూత్రములకు సమానమైనను H. యందు శిష్యాభిమంత్రణమందును V. G. యందు గణేశపూజయందును వినియుక్తమై యున్నది.

H. I, 7, 1—4 యందు సాయంప్రాతరగ్ని కార్యము ఏడు సమిత్తులతోను V. G. II, 7 యందెనిమిది సమిధలతోను చెప్పబడినది.

భైక్షాచరణము చెప్పునప్పుడు V. G. II, 8 యు H. I, 7, 11 యు సమానములుగనుండి H. యందు పాత్రమును విశేషించి చెప్పక పాత్రమునకును దండమునకును ఒకే మంత్రము చెప్పబడి V. G. యందు 'శరావం కఠినం వా భైక్షపాత్రం దద్యాత్' అను విశేషవిధియు చెప్పబడి H. యందు చెప్పబడిన ఒకే మంత్రమును రెండుగా విభజించి దండమునకు పాత్రమునకు ప్రత్యేకవినియోగము చెప్పబడినది. నిత్యభైక్షమును గురువునకొసంగునపుడు గురువునకెదురుగ నిలచు శిష్యుడు వానిని అతిక్రమమందు దండించు నాచార్యుడు వీని నిస్తరము V. G. యందు చెప్పబడినది.

H. I. 8 యందు సంగ్రహముగ చెప్పబడిన శిష్యశిక్షాక్రమమునకే V. G. II, 9, 11 నందు 'అథ పారాయణవ్రతాని' అని యారంభించి విస్తరము చెప్పబడియున్నది. ఉపాకర్మప్రకరణమందు V. G. II, 12 కున్నూ ఆ ప్రకరణమందలి H. II, 18 కున్నూ యెట్టి సామ్యము లేనందున యీ భాగము H. లో ప్రక్షిప్తమని యెంచదగినది.

సమావర్తనమందలి ప్రకరణము సరిగా H. I, 9—13 నుండి V. G. II, 13, 17 యందు నివేశింపబడినది. H. లో సోమస్య తనూరసి మంత్రము రెండు వస్త్రములకును చెప్పబడగా V. G. యందిది అధోవస్త్రమునకు మాత్రమే వినియోగింపబడి ఉత్తరీయమునకు మంత్రాంతరము చెప్పబడినది. 'ఆభరణ కుండలమణీన్ బదరేణ సువర్ణేన వా కృత్వానాచ్ఛాద్య' అను V. G. వాక్యము H.యందలి 'చందనమణి' యను వాక్యాభిప్రాయమే అయియున్నది. విరాజం చ, స్వరాజంచ మంత్రములచే చెప్పబడిన కుండలధారణము 'ఋతుభిరిష్ట్వా' యను మంత్రముచే చెప్పబడిన ధారణము మాత్రము H. లో భిన్నముగ నున్నది. అంగులీయాభరణ (పవిత్ర) ధారణము H. యందు అగుపడలేదు. V. G. యందు అద్దము చూచుకొనుటకు చెప్పిన దేవస్యత్వా మంత్రము ఆ యర్థమందు సంగతముగాలేదు. H. యందలి యన్మేమనః పరాగతం మంత్రమే అద్దమునకు తగియున్నది. దేవస్యత్వా మంత్రముకుండగ్రహణమందు H.లో వినియోగమున్నది. ఈలాటి భేదమువలన V. G. యందా మంత్రమే దండగ్రహణమునందును వినియోగింపబడవలసివచ్చినది. పాదుకారోహణమంత్రముతుల్యముగనున్నది, ఛత్రగ్రహణమందు V. G. లో చెప్పిన రెండు మంత్రములలో మొదటి దానిని మాత్రమే H. చెప్పుచున్నది.

స్నాతకుని రథాదియాత్ర, కన్యాప్రదాత వరుని పూజించుట రెండు సూత్రములందు తుల్యముగ నున్నది.

స్నాతకునికి మధుపర్కదానాదులు H. యందు సంగ్రహముగ నుపదేశింపబడినవానిని V. G. విస్తారపరచినది. అమృతాపిధానమసి మంత్రముచే కట్టబడిన గోవును తత్సంభూతమంత్రముచే విసర్గము V. G. యందు క్తమైనది. H. యందన్ననో గోవిసర్గమందు వరుని యనుమతి దానమందు రెండవ మంత్రము చెప్పబడినది. ఇచ్చట V. G. కారుడు మధుపర్కప్రయోగమును సొగసుగ నుపదేశించి ఆప్రత్యేకతను ఇత్యేకే యను పదములచే చెప్పియున్నాడు. V. G. II, 17 లో ద్యౌస్త్వా దదాతు మంత్రము బ్రాహ్మణ భోజనమునందు క్తమై .17H నందు భుజించు బ్రాహ్మణుడుచ్చరించుటయందు వినియోగింపబడినది. ఇంద్రాగ్నీ మంత్రమునకు H. 18 యందు భోజనతృప్తుడగు బ్రాహ్మ

ణుని వాక్యమందును V. G. యందు యజమానవాక్యమందును వినియోగము కలదు.

ఇట్లే నూతనదంపతుల, యగ్నిశాలాప్రవేశము, లాజహోమము, సప్తపదము చతుర్థవాసారంభము లందత్యంతతౌల్యము కలదు. ధ్రువదర్శనమునందు కూడ ' సా యది న పశ్యేత్పశ్యామీత్యేవ బ్రూయాత్ ' అను విధానముకూడ పారస్కరసూత్రము I, 8, 20 నందువలె నున్నది.

చతుర్థీకర్మయందు H. I 24, 3 యందలి అభిగమనము ఉపగమనము గను ఆలింగనము మైథునముగను V. G. యందు చెప్పబడినది.

V. G. యందు గర్భాధానమందు చెప్పబడిన వృషాసి మంత్రముచేనైన యవదానము H. II. 2 లో పుంసవనమందగుపడుచున్నది. పరాంచ త్వాం మంత్రముచేనైన V. G. యందలి యభిమంత్రణము H. II. 27 నందు గర్భస్రావశంకయందు పఠింపదగినట్లున్నది. ఈ గర్భసంస్కారకాలములో పరస్పరము భేదాభిప్రాయము కలదు.

నూత్నజాతునకు H. II, 3, 7 యందు సకృత్తుగ చెప్పబడిన ఘృతప్రాశనము V. G. III, 15 యందు ఆవృత్తముగ చెప్పబడినది. H. II, 3, 11-4 నందు తల్లియంకమునందు శిశువును గూర్చుండ బెట్టుటకేర్పడిన వాక్య మంత్రమునే రెండుగా భాగించి మొదటిభాగమును శిశువును కూర్చుండబెట్టుటకును రెండవ భాగముచే మాతృస్తనక్షాలనము చేయుటకును V. G. యందు చెప్పబడినది. ఈక్షాలనమునకు H. యందు మంత్రము లేదు. నామకరణమందు తౌల్యముకలదు. అన్నప్రాశనమందు H. II, 5 యందలి యభిప్రాయము V. G. III, 2 యందు ముచ్చటగ విపులీకరింపబడి యున్నది. ప్రవాసాగమనమందును స్వల్పభేదము గల్గి H. యందే వివరణమున్నది. చూడాకర్మయందు రెండు సూత్రములకు ప్రయోగక్రమమంత్రములందు స్వల్పభేదము కలదు. ఈ పై యంశములను విమర్శించగా V. G. సూత్రము H. సూత్రము ననుసరించి వ్రాయబడినదనుట స్పష్టపడగలదు.[1]

[1]Surveying all these points one can scarcely shut ones eyes without regard to all uncertainty of manuscript tradition of the V. G., that the concerning sections of the same are borrowed from H. and

V. G. II, III లలో పేర్కొనబడిన సంస్కారములు వివరింపబడుటలో V. G. I, 1 లో నుపక్రమింపబడి గణియింపబడిన క్రమముగ నుపదేశింపబడలేదు. ఇదియును పై సంస్కారములను చెప్పునప్పుడు సూత్రకారుడాకరాంతరమును అనుసరించినాడనుటను స్పష్టపరచుచున్నది. V. G. I, 1 నందు చెప్పిన పరిగణనక్రమము ప్రకారము V. G. IV నందు సప్తపాకయజ్ఞములు మాత్రము చెప్పబడి శ్రౌతసూత్రమందు హవిర్యజ్ఞములు సోమయజ్ఞములు ఉపదేశింపబడియున్నవి. సంస్కారసంఖ్యాపరిగణనము ఋతుసంగమనమారంభించి పాణిగ్రహణముతో ముగింపబడినది. V. G. IV, 2–14 లో పై యన్నిసంస్కారములకు న్యూనాతిరేకములందు ప్రాయశ్చిత్తముపదేశింపబడినది. V. G. VI, 2 యందు ఋతుసంగమనప్రాయశ్చిత్తము మొదటిదిగను ఋతుసంగమనవర్జమగు నాందీముఖప్రాయశ్చిత్తము రెండవదిగను చెప్పబడినది. 3 నందు గర్భాధానపుంసవనసీమంతోన్నయనవిష్ణుబలిప్రాయశ్చిత్తము, 4 నందు జాతాశౌచము, జాతకాగ్నిప్రాయశ్చిత్తము, 5 నందు వర్షవర్ధన ప్రాయశ్చిత్తము అన్నప్రాశన ప్రవాసాగమన పిండవర్ధన ప్రాయశ్చిత్తములు, 6 నందు సాధారణ ప్రాయశ్చిత్తము, 7, 8 లందుపనయన ప్రాయశ్చిత్తము, 9 యందు అవకీర్ణప్రాయశ్చిత్తము, 10 యందు పునరుపనయనము 11 పారాయణ వ్రతబంధవిసర్గ ఉపాకర్మ సమావర్తన ప్రాయశ్చిత్తము, 12–14 లందు పాణిగ్రహణ ప్రాయశ్చిత్తము చెప్పబడినవి.

ఇట్లు విభిన్నప్రక్రమముగ (V.G. II, III, లు V. G, VI 2—14 లలోని) వివరణమువలన యీ రెండు వ్రాతలకు ఆధారములగు సామగ్రులు

---

that it throughout bears the stamp of a late time which took the liberty of altering the ritual of H., the necessity or authorization for which is in no way clear and which. on the contrary. appears to have resulted more often from negligence and inaccuracy than from intention. For the other parts of the V. G. such a direct dependence on H. or any other work belonging to this order of the Sūtras cannot be established ; the preceding might however be enough in order to show that we have to do in our text with the work of that Vaikhānasācārya, who according to the tradition of Mahādeva referred to above, closes the series of Sūtrakāras of the Black Yajurveda. (Th. Bloch)

వేరై యుండునని తలపవలసియున్నది. సంస్కారములలో గర్భాధానము నాదిగా పఠియించుటచేతనే పుంసవనసీమంతాదుల యారంభమందు అథ గర్భాధానాది యని యుపక్రమింపబడుచున్నది.

ఐనను ఈమూలాధారము లెవ్వియని విచారించినప్పుడు V. G., V. D. లకు బౌధాయనము అత్యంతసన్నిహితముగ తెలియుచున్నది. అందును విష్ణుబలి (V. G. III, 13) B. G. I, 16 కును పుణ్యాహము (V. G. I, 6) B. G. సమాన ప్రకరణమునకు మఱింత దగ్గరపోలికగల్గి యున్నవి. అట్లే (V. G. I, 2—5) స్నానశౌచాదులు తర్పణము B. Dh. II, 7—10 ను పోలియు ప్రాణాగ్నిహోత్రము (V. G. II, 18) B. Dh. II, 18, 8—13 ను పోలియు యున్నవి. అట్లే సన్న్యాసక్రమము (V. G. II, 6) B. Dh. II, 17 ను పోలియున్నది.

ఉద్దాలకప్రాయశ్చిత్తము (V. G. II, 3) న కాధారము వసిష్ఠస్మృతి 11, 76-79 కావచ్చును. మాటలలో స్వల్పభేదము మాత్రమే కలదు. పున రుపనయనమందుక్తమగు వపనమేఖలాజినదండధారణాదిత్యాగము మానవవచనముగ వసిష్ఠస్మృతి (20—18) యందుపన్యసింపబడినదానిని V. G. VI, 10 అనువదించియుండవచ్చును లేదా వపనం మేఖలా దండః ఇత్యాది మానవవచనమే (XI, 152) కూడ సాక్షాత్తుగ అనువదింపబడియుండవచ్చును. మానవవచనము (II, 37) ఇట్లే ఉపనయనకాలవిచారమందు V. G II, 3 యందు పంచమే వర్షే బ్రహ్మవర్చసకామం ఇత్యాదిచే యనువదింపబడినది. అష్టవర్షం బ్రాహ్మణముపనయీత యను శ్రుతికూడ V. G. IV, 7 చేత నంగీకరింపబడి మనువునుమతి పైరీతిననువదింపబడి యుండును.

వివాహప్రకరణమందెనిమిది విధములగు వివాహములు, ఆర్షవివాహముకంటె ముందు ప్రాజాపత్యవివాహమును పఠించుటకంటె, మనువుతో భేదమేమియు లేదు. ఆర్షవివాహములో 'యద్గోమిథునేనైకేనద్వాభ్యాం వా కన్యాం దదాతి తమార్షమాచక్షతే' యని V. G. యందును 'ఏకం గోమిథునం ద్వే వా వరాదాదాయ' III, 29 అని మనువునందును కలదు. ఆసురమందును రాక్షసమందును పైశాచమందును స్వల్పభేదమును లేక తౌల్య

మున్నది. అంతమందును 'ఏషాం వివాహానాం ప్రథమే చత్వారస్తోయప్రదాన పూర్వకాః శస్తాః బ్రాహ్మణస్య' అని V. G. యు, 'అద్భిరేవ ద్విజాగ్ర్యాణాం కన్యాదానం ప్రశస్యతే' (III, 35) అని మనువును ఒకే రీతిగ చెప్పుచున్నారు. V. G. III, 7 నందలి వైశ్వదేవహోమమందలి ఆహుతిబలిదానములు Manu III, 84—92 ను అనుసరించుచున్నవి. V. G. యందలి అగ్నిహోత్రాయ స్వాహా మొదలుగ 8 ఆహుతులు మాత్రము మనువునందు కానరాలేదు. బలి యందు మనువులో లేని విదిక్కులకు బలి V. G. యందు క్రమమైనది. ఇచ్చటి 'గృహదేవతాభ్యో యథాదిశం బలిహరణం' అని యారంభించి మధ్య బ్రహ్మకును వాస్తోష్పతికిని బలిదానము చెప్పుట ప్రతిజ్ఞావిరోధమై మనువుననుసరించిన విధమును సూచించును. 'ఉచ్ఛీర్షకే శ్రియై ఇతి పాదయోః భద్రకాల్యై ఇతి' అనుబలిదానము 'ఉచ్ఛీర్షకే శ్రియై కుర్యాద్భద్రకాల్యై తు పాదతః' (III 89) అను మనూపపాదనమునకు సరిగానున్నది. ఇతర దేవతల స్థానములు పై రెంటియందును స్వల్పభేదముగ పఠింపబడినవి. ఇచ్చటి శునాం చ మంత్రమందు మనువు 92వ శ్లోకమందలి మూడు మొదటి పాదములు కలవు. గ్రహపూజయందలి విధానము B. G. లో కంటె యాజ్ఞవల్క్య స్మృతికి సన్నిహితము కాదు. అట్లే 'ఋతురాత్రయో ద్వాదశ భవంతి' యను V. G. III సూత్రార్థముకూడ యాజ్ఞవల్క్య I, 79 కంటె మను III, 46—48 కే సన్నిహితమైనది. V, D. యందలి యొక్కవాక్యమందు సాక్షాత్తుగ యాజ్ఞవల్క్యుడు పేర్కొనబడియున్నాడు. V D. I, 9 లో భిక్షు భేదమగు కుటీచకులలక్షణమును చెప్పునప్పుడు 'కుటీచకా గౌతమ భారద్వాజ యాజ్ఞవల్క్య హారీతకప్రభృతీనామాశ్రమేష్వష్టౌ గ్రాసాన్ చరన్తో యోగమార్గతత్త్వజ్ఞా మోక్షమేవ ప్రార్థయన్తే' యని చెప్పబడినది. ఇచ్చటి ఆశ్రమేషు శబ్దము గౌతమాదులు వసియించెడి పవిత్రప్రదేశములను నర్థమందుగాక గౌతమాద్యుక్త శాస్త్రములను నర్థమిచ్చును. పై కుటీచకులను భిక్షువులు యెనిమిది కబళములు మాత్రమాహారమును తినుచు గౌతమాద్యుక్త శాస్త్రములననుసరించుచుందురని చెప్పబడినట్లు తోచుచున్నది. కాగా V. D. రచనాకాలమును యాజ్ఞవల్క్య స్మృతి ప్రమాణ గ్రంథమై యొప్పెనని చెప్పవచ్చును.

దీనికంటెగూడ స్పష్టముగు నొక్క వాక్యమందు అర్వాచీనులగు శ్లోక స్మృతికర్తల పరిగణనముగుపడుచున్నది. అనగా ఉపాకర్మ ప్రకరణమందు

(V. G. II, 12) వైశ్వేరు దేవతలు, ఋషులు, వేదములు ఆదిగాగల తర్పణములు చెప్పబడుచు 'ఉశనసే, చ్యవనాయ, బృహస్పతయే, సోమయాంగిరసే, దర్భాయ, శంఖాయ లిఖితాయ' అను పేర్లుగూడ చేర్చబడియున్నవి. ఆ పేర్లు ఇప్పుడు వాడబడు గ్రంథముల నిర్మాతలవేననుటలో సందియములేదు. సోమ యనునది పొరపాటు కావచ్చును. దర్భ యనునది దక్షయనుటకు బదులుగ చెప్పబడియుండును. ఈ వాక్యమునందు ఈ సూత్రము అర్వాచీనమైనదనుటకు సాక్ష్యమును చూడవచ్చును.

ఇంకను V. G, యందు కొన్ని సుశ్రుతమందుండి తీసికొనబడిన భాగములు సాక్ష్యము కలవు. V. G. II, 10 లోని 'అథ గృహీతగర్భాలింగాని' యను సూత్రమంతయు సుశ్రుత శారీరస్థానము అధ్యాయం 3 P. 321 (Edn., Calcutta H 1838/36 Vol. I.) నుండి తీసికొనబడియున్నవి. ఇంకను ఇట్టివి కొన్ని పంక్తులు సుశ్రుతమందుండి సంగ్రహింపబడినవి కలవు. V. G. III, 9 లోని 'లక్ష్మణవటశుంగసహదేవీనామన్యతమేనాభిషూయ ప్రక్షిపేద్దక్షిణ నాసాపుటే పుత్రకామాయ వామే స్త్రీకామాయ నిష్ఠీవనం న కుర్యాత్' అను నస్పష్టార్థమగు సూత్రము సుశ్రుత శారీరస్థానము (2 అధ్యాయము 317 Vol. I) నందలి 'లబ్ధగర్భాయా లక్షణవటశుంగసహదేవానామన్యతమం క్షీరేణాభిషుత్య త్రీంశ్చతురో వా బిందూన్దద్యాత్ దక్షిణనాసాపుటే పుత్రకామాయై న చ నిష్ఠీవేత్' వాక్యమునుండి సంగ్రహింపబడినది. అచ్చటనే 'పరమదృష్ట్వా భర్తారం పశ్యేద్యస్మాదృతుస్నాతాయాదృశంపురుషం పశ్యేత్తాదృశీప్రజాభవతి' యను V. G. వాక్యము 'పూర్వం పశ్యేదృతుస్నాతా యాదృశం నరమంగనా, తాదృశం జనయేత్పుత్రం భర్తారం దర్శయేదథ' యను సుశ్రుతశ్లోకము యొక్క పరివర్తనమే కాగలదు. ఇట్లే జాతకర్మయందలి V. G. III, 14 నందలి 'స్త్రియ స్తిస్రశ్చతస్రో వా పరిగృహ్యైనాం సంవాహయేయుః' అను వాక్యము అచ్చటి సుశ్రుతార్థమునే సంగ్రహించినది. 'కుక్షౌశిథిలే హృదయబంధం ముక్త్వా సశూలే జఘనే ప్రజాయత ఇత్యవధారయేత్' అను V. G. వాక్యము 'జాతే హి శిథిలే కుక్షౌ ముక్తే హృదయ బన్ధనే, సశూలే జఘనే నారీ జ్ఞేయా సా తు ప్రజాయినీ' అను సుశ్రుత శ్లోకపరివర్తనముగాక వేరుగాదు. సుఖ

ప్రసవముకానంతట చేయు సంస్కారములు V. G. యందును సుశ్రుతమందును ఏకరీతిగనున్నవి.

V. G. 'గర్భసంగే విశల్యాం సువర్చలాం వా యోనావనిష్పీడ్య నిదధ్యాత్ ధూపయేత్పిండీతకేన కృష్ణాహినిర్మోకేన వా యోనిం హిరణ్యపుష్ప్యా మూలం హస్తపాదయోరాదధాతి'. సుశ్రుతం 'గర్భసంగే తు యోనిం ధూపయేత్ కృష్ణసర్పనిర్మోకేన పిండీతకేన వా బధ్నీయాద్ధిరణ్యపుష్పీమూలం హస్తపాదయోరాధారయేత్సువర్చలాం విశల్యాం వా ' ఈ రెండు సందర్భములును ఒకే రీతిగ నున్నవి. పై కారణములవలన V. G. యును V, D. యును (1) భిన్న భిన్న మూలములనుండి తయారుచేయబడినవనియు (2) ఇతర సూత్రములకంటె నర్వాచీనమైనవనియు నిర్ణయింపవచ్చును. ఈ రెండు సూత్రములును ఒకే రచయితచే రచియింపబడినవనికూడ చెప్పదగును. వీనివలెనే వైఖానస శ్రౌత సూత్రమొండు కలదు. ఇత్యాది V. G. & V. D. ల కంటె ప్రాచీనమైనట్లు మూడు నిదర్శనములు తెలియవచ్చుచున్నవి.[1]

ఇట్లే పిండపితృయజ్ఞ ప్రకరణమందు V, G. కిని V. D. కిని సంబంధము కొంచెముగ తెలియవచ్చుచున్నది.[2] శ్రౌతసూత్రసాధారణముగ నీపిండపితృయజ్ఞము స్మార్తసూత్రమందుపదేశింపబడుచు V. G. యందనాహితాగ్నికల్పము వేరుగ చెప్పబడినది. శ్రౌతసూత్రమందును పిండపితృయజ్ఞ ప్రస్తావము చేయబడియున్నది. ఇంకను మించి V, S., V, D., V. G. లకు సన్నిహిత సంబంధాంతరమున్నట్లుకనుబడదు. V. D. తో V. G. కు గల సంబంధము మరియొక చోటనున్నది.[3]

---

1. V. G. IV 3, 'గాముపాకృత్య పశుబంధవత్సంజ్ఞప్య ఉత్ఖిద్య వపాముద్ధృత్య సహ వపామితిహోమం చామనన్తి.' 'V. G. V 4' 'ఉత్తరేణ ప్రోక్షణీం సంస్కృత్య మృత్పాత్రం దారుచితం చాఽథప్రోక్ష్య దర్శపూర్ణమాసవత్తూష్ణీమాజ్యాని గృహ్ణాతి' V. D. II, 1 'దర్శపూర్ణమాసవిధానేవ దర్భాదీన్ సంగృహ్య '

2 'అథాతోఽమావాస్యాయాం పిండపితృయజ్ఞం యజేత' V. G. IV 6 'అనాహితాగ్ని శ్చైవమౌపాసనాగ్నౌ చరుం శ్రపయిత్వా etc., and 'అథోపవసథేఽమావాస్యాయామపరాహ్ణేఽధివృక్షసూర్యే వా పిండపితృ యజ్ఞేన యజేత ' V. S. III, 6-9.

3. 'వనస్థస్య శ్రామణకాగ్నేః కుండమాధాన విశేషం చ ధర్మే వక్ష్యామః' V. G. I, 8.

V. G. – V. D. లకు మాత్రము V. S. తో సంబంధము స్పష్టముగా తెలియవచ్చుచున్నది.[1] కాగా ప్రథమమందు శ్రౌతసూత్రమును వ్రాసిన సూత్రకర్త సులభముగా తరువాత చెప్పఁబోవు గ్రంథభాగములందు పూర్వోక్తములను పరామర్శించియున్నాడని చెప్పవచ్చును. ఈ యంశము V. G. V. D, ల యందుకానవచ్చెడి ' యథోక్తం-పూర్వోక్త ' మొదలగు మాటల వలన స్పష్టముకాగలదు. ఇట్లే V. D. కూడ ఇతర సూత్రములకు సంబంధించిన ధర్మ సూత్రమువంటిదిగాక కేవల గృహ్యధర్మమునకు మాత్రమే వ్యాఖ్యానరూపమైనట్లున్నది.[2] ఇందు సాధారణధర్మోపన్యాసము కానరాదు.

వై. గృ. వై. ధ. లు [3]రెంటికి పరస్పర సంబంధమును తెల్పునుదాహరణాంతరములుకలవు. [4]వై. ధ. యందు పరామర్శింపబడిన అధ్యయన కాలపరిమితి వై. గృ. యందొక్కచోట తప్ప వేరుగ వై. గృ. యందు చెప్పబడలేదు. ఇట్లే జాతకర్మయందలి [5]యరిష్టాగారపరామర్శ మెచ్చటను ఈ సూత్రములందు కానబడుటలేదు. ఆపరామర్శము [6]సుశ్రుతశారీరస్థానమునే చెప్పదగుననుటలో సందియములేదు. వై. గృ. 6, 7 లలో చెప్పబడిన ప్రాయశ్చిత్తములేమి వై. గృ. యందు చెప్పబడిన యంశములేమి చాలచోట్ల పునరుక్తములుగా కానవచ్చెడిని. ఉదాహరణముగ వై. గృ. 2,3 యందు బ్రాహ్మణ వటువునకుపనయనకాలము [7]మతభేదముచేత పంచమాదివర్షంబులందుపదేశింపబడి

---

1. ' ఉదక్యాద్యశుచి సంసర్గే చ విధానం యజ్ఞప్రాయశ్చిత్తేవ వ్యాఖ్యామః'

2. ఇతి గృహ్యే ధర్మే ప్రథమః ప్రశ్నః V. D. I, 11.

3. 'యథోక్తవర్షేషు బ్రహ్మచారిధర్మాన్యనుతిష్ఠతీతి విజ్ఞాయతే వై. గృ. 2, 8.)

4. ' ద్వాదశసమా వింశతిసమా వా గురుకులే స్థిత్వా వేదాన్ వేదౌ వేదం వా సూత్రసహితమధ్యయనం కృత్వా' (వై. ధ. 3.)

5. ' అరిష్టాగారం యథోక్తం కృత్వా ' (వై. గృ. 3-14).

6. సుశ్రుతశారీరస్థానం అధ్యాయం 10.

7. ' అథగర్భాధానాది వర్షే పంచమే బ్రహ్మవర్చసకామమాయుష్కామమష్టమే నవమే శ్రీకామం వసన్తే బ్రాహ్మణముపనయీత' (వై. గృ. 2-3.)

[1]వై. గృ. 6, 7 లో నెనిమిదవ వత్సరంబున చేయదగునని శ్రుతిచెప్పినట్లు వ్రాయబడియున్నది. ఈ మాదిరి అపక్రమములు అసంబద్ధములునగు గ్రంథ సందర్భములవలన రెండంశములను మనము నిర్ణయించదగియున్నది. వివిధము లగు మూల గ్రంథముల నాధారముగ చేసికొని వ్రాయుటచే ఏక వాక్యతను నిర్వహించుట కవకాశము కలుగలేదనియు, ఆయామూలగ్రంథాధారముల నుదహరించుటను మానుట కిష్టపడకుండుటచే పునరుక్తములు మొదలగుపై దోషములు సంభవించుట సహజమనియు నిర్ణయింపవలెను.[2]

వైఖానస ధర్మసూత్రము నాలుగాశ్రమములను అందలియవాంతర భేదములను ప్రస్తావించుటతో యారంభమైవాన ప్రస్థులలో సపత్నీకులు అపత్నీకులునను రెండు విభాగముల జెప్పినది. అందు తిరిగిసపత్నీకులు నాల్గు విధములుగను సపత్నీకులు వారువారు గడపు జీవితమునుబట్టి బహు విధములుగను విభజింపబడిరి. ఈ విభేదములను మనము పరిశీలించినపుడు ఇందు సగముకు పైబడిన భేదములు ఇతర ధర్మ సూత్రములందు కానవచ్చు చున్నవి. ఇందలి 'కాలాశికాః కాలాన్తర భోజినః ఏకకాలాశికాశ్చతుష్కాలికాః' (వై. ధ, 1, 8) అను నంశము [3]విష్ణుస్మృతియందు లభించు చున్నవి. తరువాత 'అశ్మకుట్టాః, దంతోలూఖలికాః' అను భేదములు విష్ణు 95–14 మను 6, 7 యాజ్ఞవల్క్య 3-49, యందును చెప్పబడినవి. 'ఉంఛవృత్తికాః, సందంశవృత్తికాః' అను పదములు బౌధాయన ధ. సూ.

---

1. 'అష్టవర్షం బ్రాహ్మణముపనయీతేతి శ్రుతిః' (వై. గృ. 6-7).

2. In an author who composed his work from different sources such inconsistencies can also depend upon a difference of the sources, which lie at the base which he found as inducement to reconcile and indeed so much the less as the principle of Ekavākyata of all texts was not of much importance to him as to later commentators. As effort at completeness prevailed with him which tempted him, besides to exhaust, also much as possible the Gṛhya and Dharma material to the corresponding passages, which in old works always overlapped each other whereby repetitions of earlier statements become inevitable. (Bloch)

3. 'వానప్రస్థః నక్తాశీ స్యాత్ ఏకాన్తర ద్వ్యన్తరాశీ వా స్యాత్' (95, 5, 6).

3-2, 14, 19 లందు వివరింపబడినవి. 'కపోతవృత్తికాః,' అను పదము బో. ధ. సూ. 1-2, 15 నందును, విష్ణు. 14-17 నందును లభించుచున్నవి. ఇట్లే 'మృగచారికాః' పదము కూడ బో. ధ. S. lc. 19 నందు చెప్పిన 'మృగైః సహ పరిస్పందః సంవాసస్తైభిరేవ చ' తైరేవ సదృశీ వృత్తిః ప్రత్యక్షం స్వర్గలక్షణం' అను పదము 'హస్తేనాదాయ ప్రవృత్తాశినః' (బో. ధ. lc. 3-11) వాక్యమునందు వ్యాఖ్యానింపబడినది. 'కుః-మాశినః' 'పాండుపత్రాశినః' అను వారలు విష్ణు 95-7 and 9 మను 4-21 నందును చెప్పబడిరి. 'పంచాగ్నిమధ్యశాయినః' అనువారలకును విష్ణు lc. 2 ff. మను 6-23, యాజ్ఞ 3-52, నందు పరామర్శముకలదు. మిగిలిన 'ధూమాశినః పాషాణాశినః, వీరాసనశాయినః కంటకశాయినః ఊర్ధ్వబాహుకాః అధోముఖాః ఏకపాదస్థితాః' మొదలగు భేదములుకూడ మను 6, 24 నందు వ్యాఖ్యాతలచే వైఖానససూత్రమందు చెప్పబడిన తీరుననుందురని చెప్పబడినది. (See Buhler's note to his translation of this passage S B. Vol. XXV p. 203).

[1]సపత్నీకులచాతుర్విధ్యము భాగవత పురాణమందు చెప్పబడినది. (3, 12-43).

వై. ధ. lc. 9 యందు చెప్పబడినరీతిగనే భిక్షుభేదములను 'కుటీచకాః, బహూదకాః, హంసాః పరమహంసాః' అనువారలనుగ మహాభారతము 13, 64, 78 ద్వాదశమహావాక్యము, పరాశరమాధవీయమందు హారీతవచనము, భాగవత పురాణములును చెప్పుచున్నవి. Bh. పురాణమందు కుటీచరాః అనియు బహూదా అనియు, పరమహంసా అనుటకునిష్క్రియాః అనియు పాఠాంతరములు మాత్రముకలవు.[2]

---

1. 'వైఖానసా వాలఖిల్యాదుంబరాః ఫేనపావనే' (Bh. P.)

2. వై. ధ. 'బహూదకాః త్రిదండ కమండలుకాషాయధాతు వస్త్రగ్రహణ వేషధారిణో బ్రహ్మర్షిగృహేషు చాన్యేషు సాధువృత్తేషు సప్తాగారేషు భైక్షం కృత్వా మోక్షమేవ ప్రార్థయన్తే' వృద్ధపరాశరః. తత్ర బహూదకా నామ త్రిదండకమండలు పవిత్రపాత్ర కాషాయ వస్త్రధారిణో వేదాన్తార్థావబోధకాః సాధువృత్తేషు బ్రాహ్మణగృహేషు భైక్షచర్యాం చరన్త ఆత్మానం మోక్షయన్తే' ('మాధవీయపరాశరస్మృతి వ్యాఖ్యానే.) వై. ధ. 'హంసా నామ గ్రామే చైకరాత్రం నగరే పంచరాత్రం వసన్తస్తదుపరి న వసన్తో గోమూత్ర గోమయాహారిణో

వై. ధ. 1-10 and 11 లందు చెప్పబడినయోగిభేదములకు నాకు తెలిసినంతవరకు సంవాదములు కానవచ్చుటలేదు. యోగులు ప్రథమమున 'సారంగాః, ఏకార్ష్యాః, విసరగాః' అని మూడు విధములుగ విభజింపబడిరి. ఒక్కొక్కరును వారు వారు అభ్యసించెడి యోగాంగములందలి భేదమునను సరించి పలువిధములుగ నగుదురు. వై. ధ. 1-1 లో చెప్పబడినరీతిని బ్రహ్మక్షత్రియ వైశ్యులకు విధింపబడిన ఆశ్రమములలో విసరగపక్షమును మాత్ర మీ సూత్రకారుడు నిరోధించుటను చూడగా నీనిర్ణయమునకు వచ్చు నప్పుడాతనిముందు విభిన్నములగు నాధారములుండియుండునని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ఆయాధార మేదియైయుండునో మనకిప్పుడు లభించకున్నది. ఏదియెట్లున్నను వై. ధ. యందుక్తమగునన్ని విషయములు ప్రాచీనవిఖనస్సూత్రమందుక్తము కాలేదని చెప్పజాలము. వనస్థులకు భిక్షువులకు సంబంధించిన అంశములను విస్తరించి నేను చర్చించితిని. ఈ సందర్భఫలితముగా పై చెప్పిన వనస్థభిక్షు భేదప్రకరణము మాత్రము ప్రాచీనసూత్రమందుండుటకవకాశము లేదనియు నిర్ణయింపదగియున్నది. (అనగా భాగవతాది మహాపురాణములనుండి ఈ తృతీయాశ్రమప్రకరణము భిక్షువులలో కొన్నివిధములు దరిమిలా చేర్చబడినవని నిర్ణయించవచ్చునని భావము). ఈ సూత్రకర్త పట్టుదల గలిగిన నారాయణోపాసకుడనునది కట్టకడపటిదిగ నీ వై. గృ., వై. ధ. సూ. ల యొక్క శైలినిబట్టి నిర్ణయింపదగియున్నది. ఈతడెక్కడ చూచినను అధికారితారతమ్యమును ప్రస్తావించునన్నిచోటులందును గౌరవపరకాష్ఠను నారాయణపరాయణునకే కట్ట పెట్టుచున్నాడు. వై. గృ. 1-1 బ్రాహ్మణులజీవితచర్యలచే యధికార భేదమును నిరూపించు ప్రకరణమందు కట్టకడపటిదగు మునిత్వము నారాయణపరాయణునకు చెల్లునని 'నారాయణపరాయణో నిర్ద్వంద్వో మునిః' అను సూత్రముచే చెప్పియున్నాడు. అట్లే వై. ధ. 1-1 యందు ఆశ్రమభేదములను నిరూపించు నప్పుడును నీయర్థమే వ్యక్తపరుపబడినది.

వా మాసోపవాసినో నిత్యం చాంద్రాయణవ్రతినో నిత్యముద్ధానమేవ ప్రార్థయన్తే బౌధాయనః.
'హంసాః కమండలుం శిక్యం దండం పాత్రాణి బిభ్రతః గ్రామతీర్థైకరాత్రాశ్చ, నగరే పంచ రాత్రకాః, త్రిషడ్రాత్రోపవాసాశ్చ పక్షమాసోపవాసినః, కృచ్ఛ్రసాంతప నాద్యైశ్చ మంత్రైః కృశవపుర్ధరాః'

ఆనందగిరి కృతమగు శంకరవిజయమందు వైఖానసమతనిబర్హణమను 9-వ ప్రకరణమున వైఖానసులు నారాయణ పరాయణులని చెప్పబడినది. శంకర విజయమందు వైఖానసమతమును గురించి విస్తరించి చెప్పబడలేదు. వైఖానసులు తప్తచక్రాంకణము చేసికొనుటను గురించి యచ్చటి సందర్భమును సూచించి నదిగాని వై. గృ. and వై. ధ. ల యందట్టిది కావలయునను ప్రమాణమే అగుపడదు. (శంకర విజయమందలి) వ్యాసదాసుడను వైఖానసుడు తన మతములో విష్ణువు సాక్షాత్తు పరబ్రహ్మమని చెప్పియున్నాడు. ఆ యంశమే సూత్రమందును 'నారాయణ పరబ్రహ్మేతి శ్రుతిః' (వై. ధ. 3-7) అని చెప్పబడియున్నది. ఈ సందర్భములో వైఖానససూత్రమును పై జెప్పినకారణములవలన అత్యంతము అర్వాచీనమనుగ చెప్పినచో చాలముఖ్యమగు నాక్షేపములుగలుగవచ్చుననియు నాయాక్షేపముల స్వరూపమును దయతో Mr. Hofrat Buhler నాకు వ్రాసియున్నాడు. 'వైఖానస శ్రౌతసూత్రము కూడకలదు. దానియందు పశువిసనముపదేశింపబడినది. వైష్ణవమతము వారు బుద్ధులు జైనులువలె పశుహింసను సహించరు. కాక తైత్తిరీయారణ్యకమందు నారాయణపూజను గురించి చెప్పుటచే నారాయణశబ్దనివేశము ప్రాచీనమైనదే కాగలదు' అని Buhler అభిప్రాయమైయున్నది. కాగా పై యాధారములనుబట్టి వై. గృ. and వై. ధ. సూత్రములు తైత్తిరీయ శాఖకు చెందినకట్టకడపటి సూత్రములై క్రీస్తుశకము 3-వ శతాబ్దమునకు ముందుగాని కాలముకు చెందినవై యుండునని ను దీనికి మహాదేవుని సాక్ష్యముకూడ సాధకమై యున్నదనియు చెప్పవచ్చునని Bloch దొర అభిప్రాయపడుచున్నాడు.[1]

దరిమిలా Dr. W. Caland వైఖానస గ్రంథములను గురించి ప్రత్యేక పరిశ్రమచేసి పై చెప్పిన Dr. Bloch అభిప్రాయముతో చాలవరకేకీభవించియున్నాడు. Bloch దొరకులభించిన సామగ్రికంటె అధిక సామ

1. We might infer, therefore, not to lay in this way any weight on the outer resemblence in names and for the result to be satisfactory to us, that in conformity with the tradition of Mahādeva, we have to find in the V. G. and V. D. the work of one of the youngest schools of the Taittriya Veda whose rise would have taken place not before 3rd century of our Era. (Th. Bloch.)

గ్రిని సేకరించి ఈతడు వైఖానస స్మార్తధర్మ శ్రౌతసూత్రములను స్మార్తధర్మ సూత్రముల కాంగ్లమున పరివర్తనమును వ్రాసియున్నాడు. ఇంకను మరి కొన్ని యుపన్యాసములనుగూడ వైఖానసమును గురించి వ్రాసియున్నాడు.[1] వీరివిమర్శనాచాతురియు పరిశ్రమమును లోకోత్తరమును ప్రశంసనీయమునై యున్నది. Jarl Charpenter కూడ Caland ను గూర్చి న్యాయముగా చెప్పినమాటలు గమనార్హములు.[2] ఈయన యుదాహరించిన Dr. Eggers యొక్క గ్రంథము మనకింతవరకు లభించకపోవుటచే నాతని యభిప్రాయము మనకు తెలియుట లేదు. Bloch సిద్ధాన్తము చొప్పున గాక వైఖానస మంత్రసంహిత యొకటి సూత్రముకంటె ముందుకలదని Caland

---

1. Vaikhānasa Smārta Sūtram 1927. Vaikhānaśa Srauta Sūtram 1941. English Tianslation cf V. Smārtha-sūtram 1929. (All published by the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal at Calcutta). 'Over het Vaikhānasa Sūtra' in meded der Kon A Kad Van Wetenschappen Afd Lett Deel 61 Serei A No. 88 age–(1926) and 'On the Sacred books of the Vaikhānasas'-Amsterdam.

2. The Sūtras of Vāikhānasas, I have permitted myself to write in another connection (J. R. A. S. 1930 p 916) 'which are undoubtedly of the highest for the study of Hindu ascetical life, have hitherto attracted but slight attention from the majority of Sanskrit scholars. Apart from the thesis of the late Th. Bloch, published in 1896 and from an edition of not too high value by the late M. M. T. Ganapati Sastri (1913) *the indefatigable energy and unparalleled acquaintance with Indian ritual texts of Professor Caland have alone penetrated the difficulties of the Vaikhānasa texts.*

This was in a review of the work by a young German scholar Dr. Eggers, a pupil of Professor F. O. Schrader in Kiel whose eminent researches are well known all over India. Dr. Egger's book, which is quite a valuable specimen, contains a translation together with critical notes of the Vaikhānasa Dharma-sūtra and is further provided with an interesting introduction dealing with the orders of the Hindu ascetics and especially with that of the Vaikhānasas. (Preface to English translation of Vaikhānasa Dharma Sūtra by K. Rangachari, M.A., B.L., page 1.)

నిర్ణయించెను.[1] 'అట్లే స్మార్తసూత్రము శ్రౌతసూత్రముకంటె ముందుదేనని యభిప్రాయపడెను.

ఇంకను Caland ద్వార 'Grammatical Stylistic and general peculiarities of the Srauta Sūtra.' అను శీర్షిక క్రింద చాల రిమార్కులను వ్రాయుచు వానిని సూత్రకాలనిర్ణయమున కుపయోగించి యున్నాడు. ఇట్లు కాలనిర్ణయమును చేయుటలో నాతడా నిరూపణము చేయుటచే నాప్రస్తావనమిచ్చట ప్రస్తుతమైనది. అందు 1. సంధినిగురించి: ది— 'సృజన్ తస్మిన్' (4-6) 'అభిచ్ఛాదయన్ త్రిః' (5-6) 'తస్మిన్ త్వాష్ట్రిం' (20-39) ఇచ్చట సంధి తప్పుగానున్నది. 'దోగ్ధ్రీఉపః' (13-5) ఇచ్చట ప్రగృహ్యము చెప్పబడలేదు.

2. లింగవచనములందపక్రమము-తప్పు—సృషదాజ్య, పుంలిం. (20-36) మృద్. బహువ. (1-3) ఏతం ఋగ్ద్వయం-పుంలిం. (21-2) ఛదిః నపుంసకము గానే చెప్పబడినది. 'మధ్యమం ఛదిః ప్రాంచముదంచం వా నిధాయ (14-6) అనికూడ వాడబడినది. 'రుక్మం' నపుం (11, 3-18-11) చాతుర్మాస్య పుంలిం. (1-1) నపుం (7) అస్థీన్ (21-9) అస్థీని- నపుంసకముగానున్నా వాడబడినది. మంత్రము అను పదమును అధ్యాహృతము చేసికొనదగినచోటుల కొన్నిటియందు 'త్రీన్-ద్వౌ' (3-2 5-4) తరచువాడబడినవి. ఈ ప్రయోగము ప్రాచీనతరములగు సూత్రములందు కానరాదు.

3. క్రియలు-స్మార్త సూత్రమునందువలె ఆదద్యాత్ (13-4) ఆదదీత (11-10) అను పదములు 'ఆదదీత-ఆదత్తే' అనుటకు మారుగను 'శిష్యేత' అనుటకు మారుగ 'శిష్యేత్' (21-4) అనియు ప్రయోగించబడినవి.

4. క్రియావిశేషణములో 'చతుర్దిశం' (10-4) (1-9 Sm. S.) అను వాడుక సరిగాదు. 'ఏకైకశః' అనుటకు మారుగ 'ఏకైకం ధవిత్రాణ్యాదత్తే' (13-9) అనుచోట ఏకైకం అని యుపయోగింపబడినది.

---

1. An essential feature of our Grhya Sūtra, which Th. Bloch in his otherwise excellent paper 'Uber das Grhya and Dharma-sūtra der Vaikhānasas (Leipsic, 1896) has failed to note is the following:— అని ప్రశంసించినాడు. Introd. to V. Sm. S. translation p. X.

5. సమాసములు—'రాజన్యవైశ్యౌ' (11-5, 11-12) 'క్షత్రియ వైశ్యౌ' (12-10) అనియు 'పురోదయాత్' అనుటకుమారు 'పురోదయే' (18-12) అనియునున్నది. రశనతోగూడిన హస్తముతోనను నర్థములో 'సపాణ్యా రశనయా' (19-9) అను ప్రయోగము విచిత్రముగనున్నది. ప్రాదేశ మాత్ర అనుటకు మారు 'ప్రాదేశ' అనికూడ (18-18) వాడబడినది.

6. విభక్తులు :—మొత్తముపైన ఆకారాన్త—ఈకారాన్త శబ్దముల పైన చతుర్థీ—షష్ఠులను వాడుటలేదు. అగ్నిహోత్ర్యాః (2-7) ద్వార్యాయాః (13-8) అను చోటులందుదాహరణము చూడనగును. ఇదే సందర్భములో 'ద్వార్యాయై' (15, 6-4) అని యాపస్తంబుడు చెప్పియున్నాడు. ఆపస్తంబు ననుసరించి 'దక్షిణాయై శ్రోణేః' (18-16) 'దక్షిణత ఉత్తరవేద్యై (10-5) యని రెండు చోటులందు మాత్రము చతుర్థీప్రయోగము నీ సూత్రకారుడు చేసియున్నాడు: ఈ దిగువ వాక్యములలో షష్ఠీవిభక్తులను గమనించునది. 'మహర్త్విగ్భ్యో దక్షిణా మనో వాక్ప్రాణ చక్షుషామనుదిశతి * * * శ్రోత్రాత్మాంగలోమ్నాం' (14-7) ఇచ్చట 'నిష్క్రియాయ' అను పదమధ్యా హృతముకాని యెడల షష్ఠీవిభక్తికర్థముకాదు. ఈ యంశము ఆపస్తంబ సూత్రము. (12-6, 4-6) ను హిరణ్యకేశి సూత్రము (10-15) ను బలపరచు చున్నవి. మరియు 'అస్య ప్రదాస్యన్' (18-9) యను చోట చతుర్థికిబదులు షష్ఠివాడబడినది. బోధాయనుడిట్లేవాడియున్నాడు. ధాతువుల నాధారముచేసి కొనిన విభక్తులు—క్రుధ్యతియని క్రుధధాతువు ద్వితీయాంతముతో జతచేయ బడినది: శ్రీణాతియనునది ద్వితీయాసప్తములతో 'క్వలసక్తూనాశ్వినే శ్రీణాతి' యను చోటవాడబడినది. తృతీయలో వాడవలసిన యజతేయను నది ద్వితీయాన్తముతో వాడబడినది. 'తాని (చాతుర్మాస్యాని) యక్ష్యమాణః వసన్తే వైశ్వదేవేన యజతే (8-3). 'చషాలము పవిశతి' (20-36) యను చోట సప్తమికిమారుగ ద్వితీయాన్తముతో ఉపవిశతిక్రియ వాడబడినది. ఇచ్చట 'చషాల ఉపవిశతి' యని బోధాయనుని సూత్రము.

7. ఏకార్థకమగు వాక్యమందు క్రియాద్వయము నుపయోగించుట లౌకిక సంస్కృతశైలిని సూచించుచున్నది. 'సోమేన యక్ష్యమాణ ఆదధీత

నర్తుం......సూ ష్యేత్' (1-1) అనియు నిట్లే (12-11—15-15) లందును 'రథ న్తరసామా స్యాత్' (20-14, 20-21, 23, 24, 25, 34, 21-15). లందును. ఈ వాక్యరచనము అర్వాచీనతను స్పష్టపరచుచున్నది.[1]

8. చ, వా, అను నవ్యయములు పొరపాటుగా వాడబడినవి. 'ప్రాజ స్యం చరుం చ' (8-3) ప్రాశుకీముత్తరవేదించ (8-ఎ) యజమానః పత్న్యంజలౌ చ పత్నీ దుహితుః * * * అంజలౌ నమస్యతి. (11-11) చ పత్నీ అనుట కంటె పత్నీచ అని యుండుట సరియైనది. వారుణం దశకపాలం చ (11-4) ద్వితీయం ఖరం చ (11-2) శుక్లమూర్ణాస్తుకం చ (12-19) పశ్చాద్ధవిర్భ్యశ్చ (20-30) అన్వయా వైష్ణవ్యా వా (15-7) ఘృతే చరుం వా (12-5) ప్రథమాన్మహర్త్విజః చతురో వా (14-1) వృష్ణో అశ్వస్య వా (18-1) షడ్భిర్వా రతి వా (19-6) అజస్య పదే వా (1-13) ఉత్తరం నమస్యేద్వా (1-16) స్వేనాంగేన వా (1-19) అన్యామాహృత్య వా (3-9) ప్రాగుదయాద్వా (2-1) పురస్తాత్స్విష్టకృతో వా (8-2) చైత్ర్యాం పౌర్ణమాస్యాం వా (8-3) పుణ్యే నక్షత్రే వా (10-1, 18-1) పుణ్యేహని వా (13-1).

9, అస్వతంత్రపదములస్థానము :—ప్రాచీన సూత్రమందలి పరిష్కృత భాషయందు పై పదములు వేరొక స్వతంత్ర పదమునను సరించి దాని తరువాతనే వాడబడుచుండెను.

(ఎ) అస్వతంత్ర సర్వనామములు వాక్యారంభమున వాడబడుట. ఏనం యజమానః ప్రత్యపోర్ణుతే (12-19) 'ఏనం చర్మణి నిదధాతి' (15-18) ఏనాం బహిరంజనం సాదయతి (13-13) 'ఏనం పూరయతి' (13-16) అను చోటులందు 'ఏనం' అనునది; ఏషాం దైవతాన్యభిఘారయతి' (16-25) అను చోట 'ఏషాం' అనునది; 'యద్యపరుద్ధ్యేతాస్యాగ్నిరనుగచ్ఛేత్' (1-18) అను చోట 'అస్య' అనునది; 'అస్మై దండం దద్యాత్' (10-11) 'అస్మై వ్రతం ప్రదాస్యన్' (18-9) అను చోటలందు బౌధాయనమందు 'అథాస్మై' అను మొదలగు రీతిని పఠింపబడినది.

---

1. 'Asyndetic construction, which seems to occur only in later syntax. (Relied on Speyer, Sanskrit syntax § 487).

(బి) [1]పై రీతి సర్వనామములు యుక్తస్థలములందు వాడబడకుండుట. 'యది పూర్వో భ్రాతృవ్యోమాతిక్రాన్తః (18-17) Cp. ఆప. 16-23-7; 'యది మన్యేత యజమానః పూర్వోమాతిక్రాన్తో భ్రాతృవ్య ఇతి'; యం వా ప్రస్కన్దిన్యాం భూమ్యామస్య రాష్ట్రం జానుకం స్యాదితి' (18-7) ఆపస్తంబ సూత్రమందలి మూలమును (16-9-8) పాటించక అందుచేరని 'భూమ్యాం' అను పదమును చేర్చుటచేత సూత్రకారుడు పై పదప్రయోగముల సూత్రము నుల్లంఘించినాడు. 'దశరాత్రమజస్రా అస్యాగ్నయః' (1-16) 'తదేతదస్త రాత్రేఽస్యాగ్నిహోత్రం భవతి' (2-9) త్రింశన్మానం హిరణ్యమస్య దక్షిణా' (1-16) 'పూర్వసంజాత మపరాధమస్య తదహర్నివేదయేయుః' (2-10) 'దీక్షితస్మిత్వాదన్యత్రైనం సూర్యోఽభినిమ్రోచేత్' (12-2) 'పృష్ఠమన్యో స్యాభ్యనక్తి' (12-7) Cp. బౌధాయన (6-2 : 158-2 :) 'అన్యోస్య పృష్ఠ మభ్యనక్తి' 'ఇంద్రాయ సుత్రామ్ణే త్వేతి (11-4) దీనికే హిరణ్యకేశి సూత్రమందు 'ఇంద్రాయ త్వా సుత్రామ్ణ ఇతి' యజమానబుత్విజశ్చైన మభివ్యాహరన్తి (12-3).[2] అదియుగాక. [3]ఏతం అనుటకు మారుగ 'ఏనం' ప్రయోగము తప్పుగా కూడ వాడబడినది: ఉదా:—'ఏనం మహావీరం' (13-9) 'ఏనమగ్నిం' (19-6). అన్వాదేశములగు నేనమాదుల ప్రయోగము తప్పుగానున్నదని యర్థము.

10. అవసరముకంటె నధికాంశమును చెప్పుట (Pleonasm):— అవశిష్టం * * అన్యతరత్ (10-14) 'యావాన్ పురుష ఊర్ధ్వబాహు స్తావతా వేణునా పురుషమాత్రేణాగ్నిం విమిమీతే (18-14 Cp.Ap. 16, 17-8).

11. అధ్యాహారము:—ఆవసథే పరిషదో హిరణ్యం నిధాయ (1—14) ఇచ్చట 'మధ్యే' యను పదమధ్యాహార్యము. 'అపామధితిష్ఠతి'

---

1. Enclitic pronouns not in their right place (original).

2. Further Enam is used faulty instead of Etam (original).

3. Places of other enclitics. In the correct language of the older sūtras the enclitics follow immediately after the first (accented word of the sentence. The rule is in our text very often violated.

(*a*) Enclitic pronouns at the beginning of the sentence.

(21-24) 'అపాం' అనుపదముతో 'అన్తం' అనునది చేర్చబడవలసియున్నది. 'ఆహవనీయం * * * అన్వాధాయేధ్మాబర్హిషీ' (10-6) ఇచ్చట 'ఆహరతి' యనుక్రియ తెచ్చిపెట్టుకొనవలసియున్నది.

12. అక్రమవాక్య రచనము సహజముగానున్నది — అర్ధపాత్రం ప్రోక్షణీయకుంభ ఇక్షుశలాకా * * ప్రయునక్తి (9-3) 'విశూన్తైకశూలా' (10-7) లందు ప్రథమాంతములు ద్వితీయాంతముల నడుమ చెప్పబడినవి. 4-1 లో 'శమ్యాం చోలూఖలం చ ముసలం చ దృషచ్చోపలాం చేతి' యని యున్నది. ఇట్లే (తైత్తి. సం. 1-6, 8, 3) (బ్రాహ్మణమందు 'దృషద్' అను ప్రథమ చెప్పబడినది. 'యది రథపురుషాదయో న్తరాగ్నీ వియాత్' (20-19) నందు ఏకవచనధాతువును ప్రయోగించుట యాపస్తంబ సూత్రము 9-10, 15) నందలి 'రథః' అను నేకవచనముతో నచ్చట చెప్పిన క్రియను విమర్శము లేక ఇచ్చట ప్రయోగించబడినదిగా తోచుచున్నది. యుక్తి సహితముకాని మాటలు. 'నిరూఢపశునా' అనుటకు మారుగ 'ఐన్ద్రాగ్నేన * * * నిరూఢపశుబంధేన (10-1) యనియు 'యాజ్ఞికానాం వృక్షాణామిధ్మైః' అనుటకు 'యాజ్ఞికైః వృక్షైః' (3-5) అనియు ప్రయోగములు కానవచ్చుచున్నవి.

13. ప్రాచీనతను సూచించెడి భాష కూడ విస్తారముగనే కలదు. ఐనను ఆభాషాభాగములు గ్రంథాన్తరములనుండి సంగ్రహింపబడినవి మాత్రమే. వై. (10-18, 21-1) 'ఉ'—'వై'. (20-10) అను ప్రయోగములుకలవు. ఇయ్యవి బ్రాహ్మణమందుండి సంగ్రహింపబడినవి. 'ఉభయం సమస్యేత్ ప్ర చ క్రమేత్ ఉపతిష్ఠేత3' (18-9) ఒక్కచోట మాత్రము కనుబడుచున్నది. కాని యీ సూత్రకారుడాయాకారమునైనను శ్రద్ధతోగమనించినట్లు లేదు. ఈ వాక్యము మైత్రాయణీయసంహితకు చేరి మరియొక చ కారమునుగూడ కలిగియున్నది. (Cp. ఆప. 16-11-9) 'ప్రచక్రమేదుప చ తిష్ఠేత'

14. నారాయణ లేక విష్ణునారాయణపూజ కూడ ఇందు వ్రాయబడినది. 'నారాయణం ధ్యాయేత్' (1-4, 1-14, 3-1.) 'నారాయణ పరాయణః' (12-12), ఇట్లే 18-20, 20-1, 21, 18 ల్లు కూడచూడనగును. అగ్ని

మంథనముచేయునప్పుడు తాను మంథముగను విష్ణును అగ్నిగను (1-10) చెప్పెను. బండినెక్కునపుడు తాను విష్ణువుగ నెంచదగునని (4-4) యందున్నది. ఇట్లే 2-5 కూడచూడనగును. యాగమధ్యమందు విష్ణుధ్యానము చెప్పబడినది. (17-6) ఈ సందర్భములోనే పుండ్రధారణము ప్రస్తావింపబడినది. (2-6) స్మార్తసూత్రం (1-3) ఈపుండ్రము వేదకాలముకు తరువాతిది. పుండ్రమును చెప్పిన గ్రంథసంచయములో నియ్యది ప్రాతదని చెప్పవచ్చును. అని చెప్పెను.[1]

మరియు ఆతడిట్లు చెప్పుచున్నాడు. శ్రౌతమునకుండవలసిన కొంత భాగము తగ్గినను ఈ సూత్రమిట్లు పరిపూర్ణమైనదే. మన సూత్రమందు 'యాశ్వమేధే ప్రాయశ్చిత్తిస్తాం కృత్వా' (20-35) యని చెప్పబడిన యశ్వమేధ

1. Preface to the Srauta Sūtra of Vaikhānasa, pages XVII to XXII. Now we must discuss the difficult question whether it is possible to determine the time of the composition cf our sūtra. There are indeed some criteria in our text which enable us to derter-mine, roughly, the *terminus post quem* ; in the fiist place the betel-argument. The word *tāmbūla* occurs X, 13, and, as it is highly probable that the Gṛhya-sūtra and the Dharma-sūtra are the works of one and the same author, the conclusion drawn from the occurance of this word in the Dharma-sūtra. may be applied to the whole Smarta - Sūtra. Long ago H. Kern made the observation that the habit of betel chewing must have been introduced into the country of the Hiudoos at time, which, roughly, may be determined between Caraka and Susruta ! The conclusion drawn by Speyer, from the argument of betel-chewing occuring on the Kathāsarit Śāgara, that this text (at least pait of it) can scarcely have been invented before the fourth century A. D. at the lowest rate must hold good also for the Vaikhānasa texts. And this limitation is supported by another argument mentioaed already by Bloch in his above mentioned paper, viz., that in our Sūtra occurs the Greek sequence of the planets and the designation of the days of the week after these planets, a sequence that, as Jacobi has shown in the Journal of the German Oriental Society (Vol. XXX Page 305 sqq.) must have been introduced into India after the middle of the third century A. D. (Preface V. Sm. S. p. and XV and XVI.)

ప్రాయశ్చిత్తాది ప్రసంగము సత్యమే అయినను ఆ వాక్యము మార్పులేకుండ నున్నది యున్నట్లు 28-6, 35-11 బౌధాయన సూత్రమందుండి ప్రయత్నముగ నిచ్చుట వాడబడినదై యున్నది.

సూత్రమందెక్కడ లేని ప్రాయశ్చిత్తి శబ్దమిచ్చుటనే యగుపడుచున్నది. తక్కినయన్ని చోటలందును ప్రాయశ్చిత్త శబ్దమేవాడబడుట గమనింపదగినది.[1] అని చెప్పినాడు.

మరియు ఆతడిట్లు చెప్పుచున్నాడు. తాంబూల శబ్దము 'వైశ్యతః శూద్రాయాం చూచుకః క్రముకతాంబూల శర్కరాదిక్రయవిక్రయీ' (వై. డి. 3-13) యందు వాడబడుటచే ఈ సూత్రము, ఇతర సూత్రములంతటి ప్రాతదికాదు. తాంబూల శబ్దము వేదమునందును ప్రాత సూత్రములందును కానరాదు. అయ్యది చరక సుశ్రుతుల మధ్యకాలమందు హిందూదేశమునకు తేబడినది అని సాధించుచున్నాడు.

వై. స్మార్తసూత్రము ఆంగ్లతర్జుమా పుస్తక పీఠికయందింకను ఇట్లు Caland వ్రాయుచున్నాడు.[2]

---

1. హిరణ్యకేశి శ్రౌతసూత్రవ్యాఖ్యానమందలి వైఖానస సూత్రోపన్యాసము సందేహాస్పదముగానున్నదని Caland చెప్పుచున్నాడు. 'ఆగ్నీధ్ర ఆరణ్యానుత్సృజతీతి వైఖానసః' హిర-శ్రౌతసూ XIV-3 (Pref. V. Sr. S. XXVII.)

2. The Vaikhānasa Sūtra-the most recent of all the Sūtras belonging to the Taittiriya-Sakha.

In § 1 we have seen that vernacular tradition considers our sūtra as the latest among the sūtras belonging to the Taittiriya Sakha. This view is corroborated and even proved by evidence drawn from text itself. The reader will soon observe that the style of our text is rather bad, and that its language here and there is slip-shod. More than once a *verbum finitum* or an absolutive has to be supplied. In some sentences the object of the opening words changes abruptly into another; see for instance, III, 2, where the subject of the sentence, beginning with *Kanikradādinā Kanyā grham gatvā* can be no other than the bridegroom, whilst without any transition the subject further on is *Kanyā pradah*. In the same passage after *varanama sarmāntam*, we must necessarily supply an absolutive *prōktvā* or *grhītvā*, otherwise this nown hangs in the air. Similiar case we find in V 3-(3) V 5-(8) where the verb *nikhanēt* resp.

the absolutive *baddhvā* must be supplied. The rule prevalent in good sanskrit that enclitic words are placed after the first (accsented) word, does not hold for our Sūtrakāra who writes ; *ushna sītābhirad-hi renam snāpayitvā* (III-15) ' *sa esa nagnapıaccādāno sya bhavāti.* V (6, 8 *f) tām devatām manasā havai dhyāyan nirvapēt* (I 14) *Asyā dhwaryuh...mumūrśor karnē-japati* (V I) *ēkavimisatih)* (I 14) is used as an accusative ; *vā* is put between the two connected words. *Pachanevāvasathye* (V. 7) *prosthapāda mrgasirsō vā yāvanti pumnā-māni nakshatrām* (II, 5). The optative and the indicative are used (*juhuyat* beside *juhōti)* without any apparent difference: Our author has a certain preference for a peculiar syntactical construction, which as far as I know. is not met elsewhere is Sanskrit literature ; he replaces a transitive verb by *karōti* with its object and connects with this expression the object proper, cp, *anyām vivāham kuryāt* (VI. 2) *tām punarvīvāham Kurute* (VI, 13) *Yajus samhitām svādhyāyam karōti* (VI, 8) and IX, 3) *Vedān adhyayanam karōti* (VIII, 3) ; similarly, *aupāsanam dhāryam kartum asaktah* (VI, 17) seems to express the same meaning as *aupāsanam dhārayitum asaktah*. I strongly doubt whether this is good sanskrit, at least, Speyer in his sanskrit syntax § 310 makes no mention of this use. Of a late style smacks the use of *yathā* with the meaning 'namely', in the verse itself (V. 8, 5). Another peculiarity of our Sūtrakāra is that he has a strong predilection for adverbial accusatives where the older language uses adjectives; *tatrā śitā sayītavā dakshinaśirsam, devam prāksirah sāyayitvā* IV. 10, (10) *prānmukham vadhūm upavēsya* (III 5, (6) *abhimukhamāsīnah* VI I *prānmukhamāsīnah* 1. 9, (2) *Utkutikamāsinah* IX 9 (2) *sāngushta mangulīr grhitvā* III 22. Of the same kind is *caturdisam* I 9 (8), II 5, (7) VI 1, 1-(2) *and cp pratīdik* I. 8 (2). Ungrammatical constructions are:—*havir dēvam nivēdya* (III 13 (11) IV 0 (3) *Juhuyād rchah* II (6). *Shadbhih karnē japati* II 6 (10); *pitrpindaih prētapindam sāmārōpya* VIII 8 (2); *tēna yōjayati* VII 7 (6) *Sisheyana vratam bandhayati* II 9 *taih priyatām itivācayitvā* I 6 (8) ; tarpayati and darsayati with dative IX 9 (7) and X 2 (4). Striking is the fact that our author uses the word *barhis* throughout as a masiculine noun ; I 8 (1) I-10 (3), I 21, (6) III, 4 (7) IV 5-(3) and the word *aśman* sometimes, as is usual, as a masiculine, but often as a neuter. II 5-V 6 (17) II 7 (2). Only once I have met with a archaism, a case of tmesis viz, V 3-4, *anuyajna bhāndam nayati.* In some cases we are in doubt whether the know-ledge of sanskrit of the Sūtrakāra himself is insufficient, or a corrup-

వైఖానస సూత్రము ప్రాచీనముగాకున్నను విలువగలిగిన గ్రంథమే యగు నని యాతడు ప్రశంసించి యున్నాడు.

ఇప్పటికి వైఖానస కల్పసూత్రముపై విమర్శకులు వ్రాసిన అభిప్రాయములను చాలవరకు తెలుపగలిగితిని. ఇందుదహరింపబడినవి గాక వేరెవ్వియైనను ఉన్నను అందు క్రొత్త విషయములుండజాలవని తలచెదను.

---

tion common to all the manuscripts must be accepted; as when *Pariveshtya* is used instead of *Pariveshya* II 1 (2) instead of *ayācitam ayācitena* II (3) (3) *dakshnētara* instead of dakshinōttara III 19 (13) *nirvapēt* instead of the only possible *nivapēt* V 14 sf. See also IX 12 (3), where only the Bhāshya has preserved the right reading. The diligent reader may find several other grammatical irregularities besides those I have recorded here. Therefore, we may safely draw the conclusion that the internal facts corroborate the tradition accordingly to which our sūtra belongs to a very late period, when Sanskrit was no longer a living and spoken language, but a dead one. (Preface to V Sm. S. p. XIII—XV).

1. Importance of the Vaikhānasa Sūtra.

So then the Vaikhānasa Sūtra is doubtless the latest of all the ritualistic Sūtras known to us. That this need not be a reason to depreciate its importance is obvious The works dating from a period of decadence have an equal right to our interest as the older texts Besides the clue that it furnishes for deciding some questions of historia literaria, the contents of our Sūtra, though, as is to be expected, it contains in the main the same materials as are treated by its predecessors, provide us with a great many facts, descriptions and reflexions that are unknown from other sources. I would especially call the reader's attention to the chapter I. 14 last part, where the way of the libations is discribed, how they come unto the Deities; to the Prānāgnihotrā (II-10); to the Varshavardhana (III, 20, 21); to the visit to the temple of Skanda (III, 22-b); to the Vishnu Puja (IV, 13, 12); to the highly interesting chapter where the way of death is described (V, 1); to many of the curious details of the funeral rites in this same book, among which the rite of 'Totenhochzeit' is one of the most striking (V, 9); to the different kinds of house holders (VIII-5) and of hermits (VIII-7, Sqq.); to the establishment of the Srāmanaka fire (VIII, 6, IX, 1-5); to the descriptions of the jātis (IX-11, Sqq.) Page XIX-XX, S. V. Sm. S. Tr.

వీరీయభిప్రాయములు సంకుచితములైనవి. వైఖానస సూత్రము సముచ్చిత ముగ నితర సూత్రములకంటె తరువాతిది కాదు. పై చెప్పబడినవి యుక్త్యాభాసములు మాత్రమే ననునంశము నిరూపించబడును.

భాషయందలి యసంస్కృతి యర్వాచీనతను గాక తద్విపరీతమును సూచింపగలదు. కాక అపశబ్దములుపలబ్ధములగు స్వల్ప సామగ్రీభూత మాతృకా మాత్ర సాధితములు. వైఖానస గ్రంథ సామగ్రియే నియమిత జనసాధారణమై వారలచేతను ననాలక్షితమై యున్నది- ఇందు విద్వాంసులుకూడ తరగు పడియే యున్నారు. ఇందుకు కారణమిట్టి సుప్రసిద్ధ కల్పకమునకు సురక్షిత మగు నాలవాలము లేకుండుటయే యనుట ప్రత్యక్షసిద్ధము. ఇట్టియెడ ప్రాకృత మానుషికనాంతరీయకమగు ననవధానము విస్తృతమగు గ్రంథమందు దొసగుల కెడమీయదగును. కాన విమర్శకులు దీనిని కారణాంతరములతోటి సమన్వయముచేసి తత్త్వ నిర్ణయమును చేయుట యుచితము.

బౌధాయన, ఆపస్తంబ, హిరణ్యకేశి, మను, విష్ణుస్మృతులీ సూత్రకారున కాధారములని చెప్పుచు అందలి యాయాభాగములనుండి విఖనసుడు తన సామగ్రిని సేకరించెననుటయు న్యాయముకాదు. ఈ సూత్రములన్నియు నొక దేశమందొక యాకరమును బట్టియు ఒకే సంప్రదాయమును బట్టియు స్వల్ప భేదములచే సమకాల మందే రచియింపబడి యుండదగును. రుచి భేదముచే శీతోష్ణస్థితిభేదముచే ప్రజాబాహుల్యముగల మన భారతావని యందు నేటివలెనే నాడును ప్రయోగభేదములనొక్క యాకరమగు వేదము నుండియే గ్రహించుటచే పై జెప్పబడిన సూత్రములకును తక్కిన యావద్గ్రంథ తతికిని సర్వథా సాజాత్యముండియే తీరగలదు. అట్లుండియును ఉన్నది. లేనిచో నాగ్రంథములవైదికములుగ బరిగణింపబడుట తథ్యము. ఇంతమాత్రపు సారూప్యము గ్రంథ చౌర్యమునో లేక గ్రంథకారుని సామర్థ్యశూన్యతనో చెప్పజాలదు.

ఇంక రెండవది గ్రీకు సంప్రదాయముగ గ్రహగణనమును చేయుటయను నది. సంప్రతిపన్నముగ ప్రాచీనమని యంగీకరింపబడిన విమర్శకుల బోధాయన సూత్రమందిది కలదని Bloch గారంగీకరించి బౌధాయనమందది ప్రక్షిప్తమని

సులభమగు సమాధానమును చెప్పిరి. ఆ పాఠమును ప్రక్షిప్తమనుటతో పాటు దీనిని నట్లే యుపపాదించుటయో లేక నుభయసాధారణమగు యుక్త్యంతరమును సాధించుటయో విమర్శకుల కర్తవ్యమైయున్నది. ఒక రహస్యమునునే నిచ్చట మనవి చేయక తప్పనిదై యున్నది. సంస్కృత భాషయందు ఇదం ప్రథమముగ రచియింపబడిన యనేక కావ్యములు చైనాభాషయందనువదింపబడి యాదుకు ఆ చైనాభాషయం దనువదింపబడియుందుకు సంస్కృతమూలములు కాలగర్భమందు జీర్ణమై పోవుటచే యా చైనాయనువాదమునుండి సంస్కృత మూలములను మన పరిశోధకు లిప్పుడు సృష్టించుచున్నట్లు మనము చూచుచున్నాము. గ్రీకువారి గ్రహనివేశక్రమమార్య సంప్రదాయసిద్ధమే యేల కాకూడదని నేను ప్రశ్నించుచున్నాను.

మూడవది తాంబూల శబ్దోపలబ్ధి. తాంబూల శబ్దమునకు నివేశముండవలసిన ఘట్టములెన్నియో సూత్రమందు ముందు వెనుకటి ప్రశ్నములలో కలవు. అంధుదాహరణమునకు నిత్యార్చన ప్రకరణమందు 'విచక్రమే పృథివీ' మితి ముఖవాసం దత్వా' (వై. గృ. 4-12) తాంబూల శబ్దలక్ష్యమగు ముఖవాస శబ్దము ప్రయోగింపబడినది. తాంబూలశబ్దము చెప్పబడలేదు. బ్రహ్మచారి యతి విధవాదినియమములందును ధర్మశాస్త్రములందుక్తమగు తాంబూల చర్వణ నిషేధ ప్రకరణములందును ఇది కానరాదు. దీనిని కాలాంతరమందు ప్రక్షిప్తమనియో తాంబూలము ప్రాచీనమైనదనియో నిర్వాహము చేయవచ్చును. తాంబూల ద్రవ్యములు మన దేశమందు లేవనియు నియ్యవి విదేశీయులచే నొకకాలమందు తేబడినవనియు చెప్పెడి సిద్ధాన్త మింకను విమర్శకులకే నిశ్చితము కాలేదు.

నాల్గవది (ఎ) సహగమనమును సూచించెడి 'సహమరణే' శబ్ద నివేశముగా చెప్పుదురు. Dr. Jolly కూడ సహమరణ శబ్దమునకు సహగమనమర్థమై యుండునేమోననియెను. కాని శబ్దార్థమును నిష్కర్షింప సాహసింపలేదు.

(బి) మృతులగు యుక్తవయస్కులైయవివాహితులగు స్త్రీపురుషులకు వివాహము చేయుట యనునది కూడ కాలనిర్ణయమునకు తోడ్పడను.

నారాయణ శబ్దము సూత్రమాద్యంతము వ్యాపించియుండుటయైదవది. నారాయణ శబ్దము తైత్తిరీయారణ్యకమందును కలదు. కాగా నారాయణ శబ్దము క్రొత్తదికాదు.

అర్వాచీనత్వనిర్ణయమునకు మూలాధారము వైజయన్తీకారుడగు మహాదేవుని వ్యాఖ్యానారంభ పద్యము. పాశ్చాత్యవిమర్శకులకు విఖనస సూత్ర మెట్టిదో తెలియని నాడే మహాదేవుని 'వైఖానసాచార్యవరో కరోత్పరం' పద్యము లభించి వారాపద్యమును, తు, చ, తప్పకుండా నేటివరకు జపించి యందు చారిత్రకముగ ప్రాధాన్యము గల్పించి కష్టపడుట యారనదికాదగును. ఈ పద్యము సూత్రములకు పౌర్వాపర్యమును నిర్ణయించుచున్నదనుటకు ప్రమాణమేమియు కానరాదు.

ఆగ్నివైశ్యసూత్రమందలి పూర్వాపర సూత్రములను పరిగణనము చేయు సూత్రమిందు కాధారమనుటయు కడపటిసేతువై యుండవచ్చును. ఈ పరిగణనముకూడ తత్త్వములో నట్టిది కాజాలదు.

ఉపాకర్మప్రకరణమందలి తర్పణములలోని యర్వాచీన ధర్మశాస్త్ర గ్రంథకర్తల పేరులుండుటను ముఖ్యమైన దానినిగ చెప్పుచున్నారు. 'యద్వై కించమనురవదత్' అని వేదమందుండుటచే వేదముకు మనువుకంటె నర్వాచీనతను చెప్పుటకిష్టపడినవార లీవాదము చేయనగును. శంఖలిఖితాదులు పలువురుండవచ్చును. నిర్వాహాంతరమును కారణపౌష్కల్యముచే సాధించుట యుచితముగాని యనన్యథాసిద్ధమగు ప్రాచీనతను త్రోసిపుచ్చుట న్యాయముగాదు.

---

1. 'యోవాఽత్మయాజీ స్నాతకః అప్రాప్తగృహవృత్తో మృతదారో వా మ్రియేత తస్య హ నై తద్బ్రహ్మ విఫలం మా భూదితి విశేషార్థీ యథావిభవానురూపం దక్షిణాం దత్వా తుల్యాం కాంచిత్కన్యాం తస్మై దాపయిత్వా తయా సహోషితస్య ప్రాప్తగృహవృత్తస్య పూర్వోక్తేన విధినా దహనం కుర్యాత్. తథైవ కన్యాం చ మృతాం ప్రాప్తయౌవనాం తుల్యేన పుంసా ప్రాప్తగృహవృత్తాం దహేత్' (V. G. V, 9). A note of Dr. W. Caland— 'This is one of the most interesting passages of our sūtra No where else in Indian literature this rite of 'Toteuhochzeit' has been found. (Page 142, V. Sm. Sūtra English translation.)

పై యంశములలో చాలవానిని గురించి శ్రీ కే. రంగాచారిగారు వ్రాసినసమాధానములు న్యాయ్యముగ నుండుటచే వానినిగూడ నీ సందర్భములో పాఠకులకు విశదపరచుట న్యాయ్యమైయున్నది.[1]

---

1. Noticing certain resemblences between Vai. Gr. Sūtra and Hiran Gr. Sūtra, Dr. Bloch, taking into consideration the tradition about the later origin of Vai. Kalpa Sūtra, concludes that the author of Vai. Gr. Sūtra copied such sections from Hiran Gr. Sūtra. The followers of the Vai. Kālpa Sūtra so far as the information is available have never followed Hiran Kalpa Sūtra and the change of Sūtra is considered a heinous sin against Brahmins. The Vaikhānasa community must have been in existence as such even in the centuries before Christian Era. If the Vai. Kalpa Sūtra is a work which is of a very late origin coming into existence after some centuries after Christ, what was the Kalpa which was guiding them in their Srauta and Gṛhya rites? If it is argued that they were following any other Kalpa Sūtra, how is it that they came to have a seperate work like the Vai Kalpa Sūtra?

Taking tradition into consideration that Vai. Kalpa Sūtra, was later in origin than Hiran Kalpa Sūtra, Dr. Bloch tries to prove that many sections of the Vai. Gṛhya Sūtra were borrowed or copied from Hiran Gr. Sūtra. The learned doctor says that 'one can scarcely shut one's eyes, without regard to the uncertainity of manuscript tradition of the Vai. Gr. Sūtra, that the concerned sections of the same are borrowed from Hiranyakesin and that throughout it bears the stamp of late time, which took the liberty of altering the ritual of Hiranyakesin, the necessity or authorization for which is in no way clear and which on the contrary appears to have resulted more often from negligence and inaccuracy than from intention. There are words too strong to be used in reference to Gṛhya and Dharma sūtras, however late they may be in their origins.

In the first place, the learned Doctor does not show those sūtras which have been negligently and inaccurately copied from Hiranya-kesin. From the examples quoted by him, it is clear that the

presumed alterations actually owe their origin to difference in practices. The differences found between the two sūtras are as material as resemblences between them which the doctor points to. He lightly passes over the differences between the texts of Vai and Hiran Gr. Sūtras which are not a few, and concludes from the resemblances alone that such sections were annexed from the latter into the former. The frame works of these various rites are almost the same for the followers of Sākhās of the same Vedās and as such resemblances would necessari y follow between works which deal with these rites and to conclude from such resemblences that sections of one work are copied from another certainly argues an indifferent appreciation of the practices of Brāhmanās in which alone the origins of these works lie.

We have yet to see a community of Brāhmanās following a work dealing with their religious rites written by one man of the community however learned or pious he may be,, unless such a work represents correctly the practices of the community. Further, one man does not write a Kalpa Sūtra. Kalpa *sūtras* come into existence when the rules guiding the religious (Srauta and Gṛhya) practices of a community are brought together as a compilation. In such work of compilation there is no need to borrow or copy from other sūtras whole sections and such copying would lead to the work itself being discarded. If the conservatism exhibited by Brāhmanās in regard to their religious rites and ceremonies is taken into consideration, the annexation wholesale of sections from one sūtra into another seems to us impossible. The learned Doctor's argument that the differences between Vai. Gṛ. Sūtra and Hiran Gṛ. Sūtra are due to negligence and inaccurate copying, is too big a pill to be swallowed for it is preposterous that a whole community of Brāhmanās would follow the mistakes of the author of a sūtra !

The learned Doctor referring to certain Rishis mentioned in the Gṛ. Sūtra says thus: 'There is another passage which clearly contains an enumeration of a series of authors of Matrical Law books who are scarcely known to be of old time. In the Upākarma fifty

alms are to be offered to different Gods, Rishis etc., to which the following belong; Uśanasāya, Chyavanāya. Bṛhaspataye, Sōmāya, Angiraśe. Darbhāya. Saukhāya. Likhitāya.' There is no doubt that herewith the known smritis are meant. Sōma has certainly fallen in this series through a mistake Darbhāya might perdaps be a mistake for Dakshāya. Names of Uśanas Chyavana, Bṛhaspati Angirasa, Darbha Sankha are found amongst Gotra ganas and Darbha need not be a mistake for Daksha. Likhita is not found amongst Gotra ganas but Lipt is.

In addition to those works which have been mentioned in the, previous section, there is another between which and certain sections of Vai Dharma sūtra there is a very close resemblence. The first eight parts pf the first prasna of the Vai. Dhar. Sūtra are almost the same as Āsrama Upanishad, excepting that in the former, additional matter is put in. Their contents so far as they are common are one and the same and even the sentences in the one differ little from those in the other. The Upanishad is found as the last of fifty two Atharva Upanishads. From what Dr. Schrader says it must be that there is an equally close resemblence between Vai. Dh. Sūtra and what runs under three different names which are 1. Kāuvāyanakrita Cāturmāsya Dharma. 2. Kānvāyanasmriti and 3. Kātāyāyana smriti.

Mention of Vaikhānasa Agama is found in Sitōpanishad which also belongs to Ātharva-Upanishad group.

Another work which closely resembles the parts 11.—15 of the third prasna of Vai. Dh. Sūtra is the Auśana smrti in metrical form. Of the forty three mixed castes mentioned in the Vai. Dh. Sūtra thirty four are mentioned in Auśanasmriti. The differences between the two are very slight as could not be seen from the lists of such castes appended here to while those between the names of mixed castes according to Vai. Dh. Sūtra and those given in the Law books of Baudhāyana, Āpastamba, Gautama, and Manu which closely agree with one anothers are very noticiable (preface to Vai. Dh. Sūtra translation by Sri K. Rangachari, M.A., pp. 17-20).

వైఖానస ధర్మసూత్రమందు మన్వాదులందుపలబ్ధములగు సాధారణ ధర్మములు, రాజధర్మము, వ్యవహారము మొదలగునవి లేక గృహ్యాధర్మములు మాత్రమే కలవనియు నిట్లే శ్రౌతసూత్రమందును సత్రము అహీనము మొదలగునవి కానరావనియు కాగానిది తనంతట సమగ్రము కాజాలదనియు నొక వాదముద్ధాపనము చేయబడినది. ఆపాతముగ నిందు విమర్శకులవాదముచిత ముగనే తోచినను అది సరికాదు.

వైఖానస సంప్రదాయము ననుసరించి ఈ సూత్రము తదితర సూత్రము లన్నిటికంటె ప్రాచీనమైనదనియు భృగ్వాదులు నల్వురు వారికంతరంగ శిష్యులై భగవచ్ఛాస్త్రములను వారినుండి గ్రహించిరనియు సిద్ధాన్తమై యున్నది. భృగుసంహితనే మనువుగాని మను సంహితను భృగువుగాని వ్రాసియుండినట్లు మను ధర్మశాస్త్రమందు కలదు. విఖనసుడు సంతరవముగ నుపదేశించిన గ్రంథముగాక తదితర సాధారణధర్మములన్నియు విఖనసమతానుయాయియగు భృగువు చెప్పియున్నట్లు చెప్పుదురు. ఇట్లే మరీచ్యాదులును వైఖానస మత విస్తరమును చెప్పిరి. సమూర్తార్చనమునుపదేశించిన విఖనసుని విస్తారమగు దైవికసూత్రమునే భృగ్వాదులు భగవచ్ఛాస్త్రములుగ వ్రాసినయంశము వారల గ్రంథములుగూడ మనకు లభ్యములగుచుండుట ప్రత్యక్షమై యున్నది.

శ్రౌతస్మార్తములను రెండు విభాగములనే ప్రధాన విభాగములుగ విభజించినప్పుడు ధర్మసూత్రము స్మార్తభాగముగ వ్యవహరింపబడుటయందలి యౌచిత్యమువలన 'గృహ్యే ధర్మే' యని ధర్మసూత్రఖండాంతగద్యము లందుండవచ్చును. కాని యది గృహ్యాధర్మములను మాత్రము చెప్పునర్థము నందుపయోగింపబడినది కాదని యెంచదగును.

శ్రౌతసూత్రము సూత్రారంభప్రతిజ్ఞ ననుసరించియేమి నిత్యములగు వైతానిక సంస్థలయుపదేశమునందలి సామగ్ర్యమునుసరించియేమి సోమ సంస్థలయుపదేశముతో ముగింపబడినది. ఈ సూత్రవ్యాఖ్యాతయగు సర్వ తంత్రస్వతంత్ర శ్రీ శ్రీనివాసమఖి వేదాంతదేశికుని యుల్లేఖముననుసరించి పరి శిష్టసూత్రమందియ్యవి చెప్పబడియుండునేమో తెలియదు. అట్టి సూత్రము లభ్యమైనప్పుడుగాని యందలి విషయములను సంగ్రహింప జాలము.

సంకరజాతులనుచెప్పు ఖండములందు బౌధాయనాదులలోలేని చాల పేరు లీసూత్రమందుండుటయును నర్వాచీనత్వసాధకము కాజాలదు. అట్టి భాగములు సంప్రతిపన్నములైన-చో నట్టివివిధజాతులా సూత్రప్రణయన కాలమందుండియుండి బౌధాయనాదుల కాలమందుత్పన్నమై యుండనోపును. సంకరజాతులెన్నియో ధర్మశాస్త్రములందు పేర్కొనబడినవిప్పుడు లభ్యము లగుట లేదనునది నిశ్చప్రచము.

బౌధాయనాదులకు పరిచయము గల్గిన యొక్క వైఖానస శాస్త్రము నంగీకరింపక తప్పదు కావున నాశాస్త్రమునకు సాతత్యమునందు బల్బజములగు కారణాభాసములచే విప్రతిపత్తిని కల్పించి నూతన సూత్ర నిర్మాణమును సాధించుటకంటె నట్టి కారణముల నన్యథాసిద్ధములజేసి సూత్రమందవికార్యత్వమును, ప్రాచీనతను సాధించుట యుక్తమని మనవి చేయుచున్నాను.

తిరుమల తిరుపతి దేవస్థానం ముద్రాక్షరశాల, తిరుపతి. ప్రు. 180 పే. 130. 19-8-46.

JOURNAL

OF

SRI VENKATESVARA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, TIRUPATI

1. The JOURNAL is the official organ of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute and the Oriental College, Tirupati.
2. The JOURNAL appears twice a year, in January and July.
3. Contributions are accepted mainly from the members of the Institute and the staff of the College.
4. Each contribution must be clearly written on one side of the paper only and must be completely press-ready. No additions other than corrections of printer's errors will be admitted after its acceptance for publication.
5. The Editor reserves to himself the right of accepting, rejecting or modifying any contribution received for publication.
6. Authors will receive ten reprints of their contributions free of charge.
7. The annual subscription to the Journal is Rs. 10/- post free, (inland) and 20 Sh. or 6 Dollars (foreign) to be paid strictly in advance.
8. Books on Indology, in English, Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages, are reviewed in the JOURNAL. All books intended for review are to be sent to the Editor.
9. Advertisement charges &c., may be obtained, on application, from the Editor.
10. All communications regarding the JOURNAL should be addressed to :—

THE EDITOR,

JOURNAL OF SRI VENKATESVARA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE,

TIRUPATI (SOUTH INDIA).

LIST OF SRI VENKATESVARA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS

	Rs.	A.	P
Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series :—			
1. **Sri Venkatesvara Kavya Kalapa**, Ed. by Sri D T. Tatacharya	4	0	0
2. **History of Tirupati**, Vol. II by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar	3	0	0
3. **Glossary of Indian Philosophical Terms**, by Sri C. V. Sankara Rao	1	8	0
4. **Psychology** (in Telugu) by Dr. K. C. Varadachari ...	2	0	0
5. **Isavasyopanishad Bhashya**, of Venkatanatha Ed. with English Translation by Dr. K. C. Varadachari and Sri D. T. Tatacharya	2	0	0
6. **Samurtarchanadhikarana (Atri Samhita)**, Ed. by Mr. Raghunatha Chakravarti Bhattacharya and Sri M. Ramakrishna Kavi	8	0	0
7. **Suvarnasaptati**, Ed. by Sri N. Aiyaswami Sastri ...	6	0	0
8. **Kenopanishad Bhashya** of Rangaramanuja Ed. with English Translation by Dr. K. C. Varadachari & Sri D. T. Tatacharya	2	0	0
9 **Tirukkural-Kamattuppal** with two old Commentaries Ed. by Sri T. P. Palaniappa Pillai	4	0	0
10. **Sri Venkatesvara Vachanamulu**, Ed. by Sri V. Prabhakara Sastri	1	8	0
Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute Studies :—			
1. **Theory of Knowledge in the Philosophy of Sri Ramanuja**, by Dr. K. C. Varadachari	3	0	0
2. **Rupakaparisuddhi** by Sri D. T. Tatacharya ...	2	0	0

Copies can be had of :—

THE DIRECTOR,
S. V. ORIENTAL INSTITUTE,
TIRUPATI (Chittoor Dt.)
SOUTH INDIA

Printed by : Sri A. JAYARAM NAIDU B.A., at The Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanam Press, Tirupati.—180 Copies 138 Pages—28-8-46.

Published by : Sri P. V. RAMANUJASVAMI, M.A., Director, Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute, Tirupati.

JOURNAL

OF

Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute

TIRUPATI

VOL. VII NO. 2

JULY—DECEMBER, 1946

EDITOR :

P. V. RAMANUJASVAMI, M.A.

CONTENTS

			Page
1.	Introduction to the Purāṇa Pañcalakṣaṇa: Translated by *Sri P. V. Ramanujaswami, M.A.*	...	81
2.	The Philosophy of Religion of Āḷvārs: Tondar-adip-podi Alvar. By *Dr. K. C. Varadachari, M.A.. Ph.D.*	...	102
3.	Ṛg Veda and Veṅkaṭacala: By *Sri T. K. Gopalaswami Aiyengar, M.A.*	...	122
4.	Emberumānār-neñju-vidu tootu: By *Sri T. P. Palaniappa Pillai, B.O.L.*	...	136
5.	The Interpretation of the double dates *Āṇḍu* and *Edir-Āṇḍu*: By *Sri S. Subrahmanya Sastri, B.A.*	...	144
6.	Notices of Manuscripts: 1. A Sanskrit Encyclopædia in Manuscript. 2. Catuḥṣaṣṭividyāsaṅgraha. 3. Bālabhāgavata. 4. Alaṅkārasaṅgraha.	...	160
7.	Miscellaneous Notes: 1. Is Vyāsa the same as Bādarāyaṇa. 2. Aṇṭu and etirāṇṭu in Inscriptions.	...	176
8.	Review:	...	183

SANSKRIT

1.	तत्पुरुषादिसमासीयास्संज्ञा अन्वर्थाः By *Sri T. Venkatacharya, Vyakaraṇa Siromaṇi*	...	1

TELUGU

1.	శ్రీతిరుమంగై ఆళ్వార్ల "పెఱియ తిరుమడల్" అను మహాన్వేషణము. By *Sri M. Gopalachariar, B.A.*		51
2.	సమూర్తయజనము - వైఖానసశాస్త్రము By *Sri R. Parthasarathi Aiyangar*	...	63

PURA TAMIL SANG... MADURA

JOURNAL

OF

Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute

VOL. VII JULY—DECEMBER, 1946 PART 2

INTRODUCTION TO THE PURĀṆA PAÑCALAKṢAṆA

BY

WILLIBALD KIRFEL

Translated from the German

BY

P. V. RAMANUJASVAMI, M.A.

(IX) If one and the same passage of the text appears in two or more Purāṇas in almost similar wording and varying generally only in readings, then the conclusion is obvious that this common passage ultimately goes back to a single source. Now either any of these Purāṇas has been the source and the others have borrowed the former passage of the text, or the source has lain originally completely outside the same. As the Purāṇas as such are apparently collections of texts of heterogeneous contents, only the latter possibility can be admitted in most cases where such agreements appear *i.e.*, the greatest probability will go to prove that this passage of the text, especially if it forms an isolated whole according to (its) form and contents, has once had an independent existence and then has been purely mechanically received in the Purāṇas in question. It is self-evident that the remark can also refer to singular parts of the Purāṇas or other similar collections of texts whether a parallel has been preserved or not outside the same; but above all it will chiefly be valid for the passage if we find parallel in two or more Purāṇas. Now if we push to similar longer passages of text, the

possibility to examine their readings to their correctness and to investigate the texts themselves on corruptions and individual additions, which appear at once with the comparison, follows in a similar manner. In some such cases, it is naturally indifferent whether this common passage of the text presents some uniformity *i.e.*, can be attributed to a single author according to its form and contents, or whether it already forms a collection of texts which according to the same criterion justifies the assumption of a common origin.

Some such pure deductive method of text-comparison offers generally the advantage that it advances wholly without presupposition (X) and can itself perfectly pay for all native tradition which plays a special part in the Purāṇas themselves and to a great part certainly goes back to a "pia fraus" as well as for all the hitherto set-up theories and theses. This method does not proceed consequently from the single Purāṇa (and) does not also consider this as an individual text but takes as the starting point the text-passage which appears in, as it were, agreeing words two or more times in the different Purāṇas and related texts. The common passages tally with each other to a certain extent in this manner, (and) reduce in this manner already to a single Purāṇa-text and dissolve finally completely in the outer form so that only a mere single text remains as the final result. At first sight this procedure may perhaps appear somewhat strange, but on closer examination it will turn out (to be) the sole possibility to force a way into the forest of the Purāṇas and all the texts which belong to them. Already now one will feel that this procedure, if it is successful, must lead to certain important conclusions.

According to the method sketched just now I can now thus set forth the results of my Purāṇa researches without beforehand discoursing exhaustively the traditional statements about these texts. Respecting them, the reader may be referred[1] to the diligent book "Ancient Indian Historical Tradition, London 1922," the introductory chapter of which precisely treats of this matter exhaustively. How widely I otherwise agree or differ in essential points from Pargiter who has in an earlier work similarly bungled[2] will follow in the course of this performance.

1. See also F. E. Pargiter in : Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. 10, p. 447-455.

2. The Purāṇa Text of the dynasties of the Kali Age, Oxford, 1913.

Brahmāṇḍa- and Vāyupurāṇa.[1]

The first result of the Purāṇic text-comparison is the perception that the Bḍ. and Vā. must have originally formed a single Purāṇa. Not only have both the same basic division into *prakriyā*, *anuṣaṅga*, *upodghāta* and *upasaṁhāra-pāda*, but—and that is the most essential—also the greatest part of their text agrees with each other in wording. Only (XI) in a small measure separate passages are received which, however, allow themselves very easily to be recovered from the connection (and) thus consequently must have been purely mechanically joined. The conclusion is thus legitimate that this common text-passage which I call in future (the) single Bḍ-Vā. originally formed a single Purāṇa and that through mechanical joining of separate passages in two different manuscripts the two Purāṇas at present known as Bḍ. and Vā. have originated. The many irregular readings which are to a great extent corruptions, the numerous small separate interpolations, the transposition of small text-passages which might have been occasioned already in ancient time mostly through transposition of leaves, arbitrary restoration of small corruptions and omissions (*lacunæ*) in the two texts do not go against this fact. But on the other hand the same shows that the traditional eighteen number of the Purāṇas as well as their division according to the three guṇas or that into viṣṇuite, śivaite and mixed—Bḍ. passes current as mixed and Vā. as śivaite—has nothing to do with the real origin and the essence of the Purāṇas and that these rather later speculations are at best applicable to their last definitive form as text collections.

Already Pargiter has called attention to it (viz.) that Bḍ. and Vā. have originally formed one Purāṇa[2] yet he has, so far as I see, nowhere furnished a chapter concordance which can have proved this thesis to the best. Such a concordance, and however short it may be, is precisely specially important for the Purāṇa researches as it presents at the first glance the common underlying kernel and the individual separate passages. First I will now give below one such (concordance) with exhibition of the verse numbers for the time being.

1. [Abbreviations.—Bḍ.—Brahmāṇḍapurāṇa; Vā.—Vāyupurāṇa; Br.—Brahmapurāṇa; Vi.— Viṣṇupurāṇa; Ga.—Garuḍapurāṇa: Bhg.—Bhāgavatapurāṇa; H.—Harivaṁśa; L.— Liṅgapurāṇa: Mt.—Matsyapurāṇa: Kū.—Kūrmapurāṇa: P. 1.—Padma. purāṇa (Venkateswara Press), P. 2.—Padmapurāṇa (Ānandāśram Ed.); Sidh.—Sivapurāṇa; (Dharmasaṁhita.) Var. Varāhapurāṇa]

2. Ancient Indian Historical tradition, p. 23; the same in Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. 10, p. 448 a.

On the whole it might just suffice for us to allow to find out without too great trouble for a verse of a text the parallel in the other. The large number indicates the chapter *i.e.*, adhyāya (and) the smaller (one) under it the number of the ślokas.

(XII) Chapter concordance of the Brahmāṇḍa- and Vāyupurāṇa

Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.	Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.	Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.
		PRAKRIYAPADA.			
I. 1 (174)	1 (205)	...	3 (24)	4 (34)	5 (54)
2 (48)	2 (45)	3 (38)	4 (92)	5 (141)	6 (79)
		ANUSANGAPADA.			
6 (77)	7 (80)	...	20 (39)	15.1–51a (50)	34.1–57 (57)
7 (195)	8 (209)	...	21 (81)	...	34 58–96 (39)
8 (66)	9.1–64 (64)	...	22 (35)	...	35 (47)
...	9.65–122 (58)	...	23 (226)	...	36 (33)
9 (92)	10.1–67 (67)	...	24 (165)	...	37 (30)
...	10.68–94 (27)	...	25 (92)	...	38 (78)
...	11 (64)	...	26 (50)	...	39 (64)
...	12 (43)	10 (83)	27 (60)	...	40 (26)
...	13 (24)	11 (41)	28 (39)	...	41 (90)
...	14 (42)	12 (53)	29 (49)	...	42 (81)
...	15 (17)	13.1–86 (86)	30.1–78 (78)	15.51a-61b	43.1–9 (9)
...	16 (24)	...	30 79–321 (243)	...	43.10–38 (29)
...	17 (8)	13.87–151 (65)	31 (61)	...	44 (25)
...	18 (23)	...	32 (67)	15.61b-80 (20)	45.1–20a (20)
...	19 (43)	14 (75)	33 (65)	...	45.20b–66 (46)

Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.	Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.	Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.
		ANUSANGAPADA—(*contd.*)			
16	45.67–137	24	53	(33)	(59.106-b
(69)	(71)	(152)	(123)	(58)	(36) [142)
17	46	25	54	34	60.1–62
(37)	(37)	(117)	(117)	(68)	(62)
18	47	26	55	35.1-4a	60.63–66a
(84)	(80)	(65)	(68)	(4)	(4)
...	48	27	...	...	60.66b–75
	(43)	(129)			(10)
19	49	28	56	35.4b–215	61
(197)	(186)	(100)	(94)	(211)	(186)
20	50.1–57a	29	57.1–85	36	62
(58)	(57)	(92)	(85)	(227)	(193)
21	50 57b–224	30	57 86–125	37	63
(176)	(167)	(48)	(40)	(60)	(56)
22	51	31	58	38	64
(84)	(76)	(127)	(126)	(33)	(31)
23	52	32	59.1–106a		
(108)	(99)	(122)	(106)		
		UPODGHATAPADA.			
II. 1	65.1a–120	11.1-35a	74	21	...
(125)	(120)	(35)	(32)	(81)	
2	65.120b-159	11.35b-116	75	22	...
(32)	(39)	(81)	(77)	(81)	
3	66	12	76	23	...
(131)	(152)	(46)	(43)	(81)	
4	67.1–47	13	77	24	...
(37)	(47)	(143)	(135)	(88)	
5	67.48–135	14	78	(XIII) 25	...
(106)	(88)	(117)	(78)	(91)	
6	68	15	79	26	...
(39)	(39)	(68)	(95)	(62)	
7	69	16	80	27	...
(479)	(355)	(59)	(62)	(45)	
8	70	17	81	28	...
(102)	(91)	(22)	(26)	(75)	
9	71	18	82	29	...
(76)	(79)	(15)	(15)	(24)	
10.1–52a	72	19	83.1–107	30	...
(52)	(50)	(74)	(107)	(76)	
10.52b-120	73	20	83.108–129	31	...
(68)	(73)	(23)	(22)	(39)	

Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.	Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.	Brahmāṇ.	Vāyu.
		UPODGHATAPADA —(*contd.*)			
32 (61)	...	47 (100)	...	62 (44)	87 (46)
33 (37)	...	48 (49)	...	63 (216)	88 (215)
34 (55)	...	49 (66)	...	64 (24)	89 (23)
35 (59)	..	50 (58)	...	65 (50)	90 (49)
36 (61)	...	51 (69)	...	66 (90)	91 (118)
37 (33)	...	52 (43)	...	67 (105)	92 (99)
38 (51)	...	53 (52)	...	68 (107)	93 (104)
39 (53)	...	54 (56)	...	69 (57)	94 (56)
40 (66)	...	55 (27)	...	70 (49)	95 (48)
41 (55)	...	56 (57)	...	71 (265)	96 (258)
42 (56)	...	57 (75)	...	72 (195)	97 (202)
43 (32)	...	58 (37)	...	73 (126)	98 (126)
44 (37)	...	59 (86)	84 (86)	74 (278)	99 (468)
45 (17)	...	60 (28)	85 (28)		
46 (36)	...	61 (53)	86 (69)		
		UPASAMHARAPADA.			
III. 1 (243)	100 (246)	...	105 (49)	...	110 (66)
2 (316)	101 (355)	...	106 (86)	...	111 (84)
3 (113)	102 (135)	...	107 (58)	...	112 (68)
4 (73)	103 (73)	...	108 (92)		
...	104 (110)	...	109 (55)		

The concordance first brings out clearly the separate passages of both the Purāṇas.

Bḍ. contains only two of them, namely a smaller one (I. 27) of 129 and a greater one (II. 21-58) of 2141 ślokas altogether. The first treats of Śiva's appearance in terrible changed form in the Devadāru-wood and his appeasing through the curse of the Ṛṣis' anger brought about through an ash-bath (*Dārupraveśabhasmasnānavidhi*)[1] and the latter recounts the history of Rāma Jāmadagnya and Sagara (*Sagarasya Rāmasya ca caritam*).

The separate passages of the Vā. contain altogether 2704 ślokas and have nearly the following contents: 3 forms a short description of the creation in the Vaṁśastha metre (*Sṛṣṭiprakaraṇam*), about 9.65–122 see further down, 10.68–15.17 treats of the yoga of the Pāśupatas (XIV) (*Pāśupatayoganirūpaṇam*), 16 about liturgical purificatory ceremonies (*śaucācāralakṣaṇanirūpaṇam*), 17 about the rules of the last stage in the life (*paramāśramavidhikathanam*), 18 about penitential prescriptions for the ascetics (*yatiprāyaścittavidhikathanam*), 19 about signs indicating ill-luck (*ariṣṭanirūpaṇam*), 20 about the sound Om and the merit of meditation on the same (*Oṃkāraprāptilakṣaṇanirūpaṇam*), 21 and 22 about the structure of a kalpa and the names and characteristics of 30 kalpas (*kalpanirūpaṇaṁ* and *kalpasaṅkhyānirūpaṇam*), 23 about 5 further kalpas as well as Śiva's apparent forms during the particular times (*Maheśvarāvatārayogaḥ*), 24 contains Brahman's and Viṣṇu's praise-hymns to Śiva and their occasion (*Śarvastavam*), 25 describes the origin and destruction of Madhu and Kaiṭabha (*Madhu-Kaiṭabhotpattivināśavarṇanam*), 26 treats of the origin of sound (*svarotpattinirūpaṇam*), 30.79–321 contains the description of Dakṣa's birth and sacrifice, Virabhadra's birth and the destruction of the sacrifice of Dakṣa by him as well as the latter's obtaining of the wish and song of praise to Śiva (*Dakṣaśāpavarṇanam*), 32 describes the conditions in the separate yugas (*Yugadharmāḥ*), 34.58–42.81, 43.10–38, 44, 45.20b–66, 48 treat of real or supposed Geography (*Jambūdvīpavarṇanam* and *bhuvanavinyāsaḥ*), 104 relates of Vyāsa's doubt and its solution (*Vyāsasaṁśayāpanodanam*) and 105–112 forms a treatise on the glorification of Gayā (*Gayāmāhātmyam*).

If the separate passages referred to above are thus separated from both the Purāṇas, then will remain two similar text-residues

1. Here and in the next table of contents I enclose, as far as possible, always the chapter name (colophon) in ( ).

agreeing in wording, which are related to each other somewhat as two different manuscripts of a certain work. In size and totality this also actually proves right, but we have in our case to allow for a long and, as the material accessible upto now allows us to perceive, not specially lucky traditional history. Namely, if the number of the ślokas of the corresponding chapters are compared with each other, it immediately strikes one that many tolerably completely agree with each other, while others again more or less differ from each other. Small differences find, so far as I see, mostly already their explanation in verse computation somewhat differing from each other, (and) in many we have to do without exception with smaller additions or with lacunæ in this or that text. Such additions are found, *e.g.*, (in) Bḍ. I, 5.85–141 (p. 68f.[1]), I, 9.1–8 (p. 112), I, 9.14–31 (p. 113f.), Vā. 9 68–122 (p. 107 ff.); lacunæ on the other hand, *e.g.*, after Bḍ I, 3.23 (XV) (p 47 ff.), II, 3.80*a* (p. 180 ff.), II, 66.16*b* (p. 357), II, 72.180*b* (p. 504f.), II, 74.103 (p. 533 ff.), or Vā. 27.19 I (p. 122 f.), 27.36 (p 124 f) etc. Besides both the remaing pieces still contain a great number of passages in which small additions as well as lacunæ present themselves. Whether the one or the other holds good is mostly inferred well already from the context but in other cases, perhaps, can be decided only after a thorough comparison of the old manuscripts. As the further investigation can refer only to the original kernel of Bḍ.–Vā. so necessarily their contents in brief are first to be presented and this may, for reasons of brevity follow here in the form of a tabular survey. The chapter names are enclosed according to the Vā.

Contents	Bḍ.	Vā.
Prakriyāpāda :		
Summary of contents (*anukramaṇikā*) ...	I. 1.	1
Description of the twelve-year Somasacrifice (*dvādaśavārṣikasatranirūpaṇam*) ...	2	2
The creation (*sṛṣṭiprakaraṇam*) ...	3–5	4–6

1. The numbers in ( ) refer to the pages of our text.

Contents	Bd.	Vā.
Anuṣaṅgapāda :		
The passage from the past to the present kalpa (*pratisaṁdhikīrtanam*) ...	6	7
The division into the 4 ages Kṛtayuga etc. (*caturāśramavibhāgaḥ*) ...	7	8
The creation of the Gods etc. (*devādisṛṣṭikathanam*) ...	8	9
The creation of Rudra, Dharma and the 9 Ṛṣis Bhṛgu etc. (*manvantaravarṇanam*) ...	9	10
Description of the 8 names and bodies which Rudra has received from Brahman (*Mahādevatanuvarṇanam*) ...	10	27
The races of the 9 Ṛṣis (*ṛṣivaṁśānukītanam*).	11	28
The race of Agni (*Agnivaṁśavarṇanam*) ...	12	29
Dakṣa's curse (*Dakṣaśāpavarṇanam*) ...	13	30.1–78, 31
The race of Manu Svāyaṁbhuva (*Svāyaṁbhuvavaṁśavarṇanam*) ...	14	33
The description of Jambūdvīpa (*Jambūdvīpavarṇanam*) ...	15	34.1–57 43.1—9 45.1–20a
The arrangement of the world (*bhuvanavinyāsaḥ*) ...	16–19	45.67-137 46–49
The course of the celestial body (*jyotiḥpracāraḥ*) ...	20–23	50–52
The appearance of the celestial body (*jyotiḥsanniveśaḥ*) ...	24	53
Praise-hymn to Nīlakaṇṭha (*Nīlakaṇṭhastavaḥ*) ...	25	54
Praise-hymn about the formation of the Liṅga (*liṅgodbhavastavaḥ*) ...	26	55
(XVI) The fathers and their satisfaction (*pitṛvarṇanam*) ...	28	56
The description of the Yugas ...	29	57.1–85
The fulfilment of the sacrifice (*yajñavarṇanam*) ...	30	57.86–125
Description of a *Caturyuga* (*caturyugākhyānam*) ...	31	58
The kinds of Ṛṣis (*ṛṣilakṣaṇam*) ...	32–33	59
The fourfold division of the Veda by Vyāsa, the conveyance of the Purāṇa and Vedasaṁhita to his pupils, the propagation of the Veda through these ...	34	60.1–62
The race of Manu Svāyaṁbhuva (1) (*Prajāpativaṁśānukīrtanam*) ...	35	60.63–66a, 61

Contents	Bḍ.	Vā.
Anuṣaṅgapāda :—(*contd.*)		
The races of Manu Svārociṣa (2) to Cākṣuṣa (6) and the milking of the Earth (*pṛthividohanam*) ...	36	62
The race of Pṛthu and Cākṣuṣa's creation (*Pṛthuvaṁśānukīrtanam*) ...	37	63
The creation of Manu Vaivasvata (7) (*Vaivasvatasargavarṇanam*) ...	38	64
Upodghātapāda :		
The creation of the Ṛṣis in Vaivasvatamanvantara (*prajāpativaṁśānukīrtanam*)	II. 1–2	65
Kaśyapa's descendants (*Kaśyapīyaprajāsargaḥ*) ...	3–7	66–69
The races of Ṛṣis (*ṛṣivaṁśānukīrtanam*) ...	8	70
The Srāddha ritual (*śrāddhakalpaḥ*) ...	9–20	71-83
The race of Varuṇa, explanation of Mārtaṇḍa's names, his race (*śrāddhakalpe Vaivasvatotpattivarṇanam*) ...	59	84
The race of Manu Vaivasvata (Sūryavaṁśa) with an inserted short treatise on Music (gāndharva) (*Vaivasvatamanuvaṁśavarṇanam*) ...	60–64	85–89
The birth of the Moon-god (*Somajanmavivaraṇam*) ...	65	90
The lunar race (*Candravaṁśakīrtanam*) ...	66-71	91–96
Mythological section on the glorification of Viṣṇu (*Viṣṇumāhātmyam*) ...	72–73	97–98
End of the lunar race, the races of Turvasu etc., the royal races of the future in the Kaliyuga (*Turvasvādivaṁśavarṇanam*) ...	74	99
Upasaṁhārapāda :		
The 7 future Manvantaras (*manvantaranisargavarṇanam*) ..	III. 1.	100
The description of the 7 world strata *bhūrloka* etc., the description of Śiva's city (*bhūrlokādivyavasthāvarnam*) ...	2	101
The description of the destruction of the world (*pratisargavarṇanam*) ...	3	102
The new creation at the commencement of the future Kalpa (*sṛṣṭivarṇanam*) ...	4	103

(XVII) However poor and incomplete the foregoing summary of contents may be, it allows us to perceive at the first glance a feature which is of characteristic significance. Namely, it shows that the whole material is arranged according to a true chronological principle. The real text begins with the creation at the commencement of the present Kalpa and ends with the destruction of the same and the new creation at the beginning of the next similar world-period. Now in this great time frame the whole matter is arranged in mythico-chronological order. To the first development of material follows the creation of the separate classes of beings and the gradual development of all arrangements and conditions of life, the races of the Ṛṣis and Agnis, the creation of the 1st Manu Svāyambhuva together with the description of all arrangements and things which were gathered by him somehow in the act (of creation). Then follow the creations and races of the 5 further Manus, then the creation and descendants of Vaivasvata, the last preceding Manu and lists resembling genealogical trees of both the Indian ruling races of the Sūrya and the Soma- or Candravaṁśa leading back to him. Immediately follow the lists of kings who, according to the temporal standpoint which the narrative includes, shall govern India in future; then follows a section about the 7 Manus of the future, the description of the destruction of the world after the expiry of the last Manu-period and finally again the new development of the Cosmos at the end of the Brahma-night. But not only this outer material arrangement, but also many remarks inside the text refer always again to the mystical periods of Indian chronology and with it to the principle accomplished in it.

But a scheme of the material arrangement like this cannot exhibit the final result of a long period of development, *i.e.*, of a process which according to the usual acceptance shall have continued for a long time and according to this a whole series of Paurāṇikas must have participated—in longer durations of time and in a number of contributors the accomplishment of such a principle is certainly wholly impracticable— ; on the contrary it must be the work of a single man, for only a single (man) is able to proceed systematically in that style. Now either this one (man) is himself the author of the whole text or is only a reviser, who collected and arranged the already existing text-passages and combined (them) with one another into a unit by means of special contributions, enlargements and touchings. (XVIII) That the latter probability is true becomes certain through comparison with other Purāṇas.

For a true chronological establishment of this activity of the reviser the Bḍ.-Vā. contains an important datum which makes it possible to determine the *terminus a quo*. Namely the section which contains the lists of the Indian kings of the future breaks off with Candragupta I. and thus must certainly have been closed between him and Samudragupta, *i.e.*, somewhere between 320 and 335 A.C.[1] Now whether this section, as Mr. Pargiter seeks to prove, is borrowed from a Bhaviṣyap.[2] and is translated from the Prākrit into Sanskrit[3] or whether it, what to me appears probable, goes back to an independent text, is for us a question of only secondary significance. Only the fact is interesting to us to this moment that perhaps the year 335 signifies the *terminus a quo* for the indicated activity of the reviser, but in connection with which it must be stressed that this date does not apply to the whole of the Bḍ.-Vā. and can (only) apply to the borrowed text material.

Now a glance at the arrangement of the substance in the other Purāṇas shows that in them also is demonstrable a certain chronological scheme but it is not carried through consistently as in the Bḍ.-Vā. Thus, for instance, the Vi. also begins with the creation and ends, if we strike off the final chapter of Adhy. VI. 7, with the destruction of the world. The essential difference, however, is this, that here the Manvantaras of the past and the future are not separated from each other and the Kṛṣṇa epic, which occupies the whole of the 5th Book, follows only the races of kings ruling in the future (and) thus stands in (a) chronologically wrong place. But while the Vi. exhibits this latter section in the appropriate place (and) thus annexes it directly to the Somavaṁśa,[4] it is taken in in the Mt. away from the first parallel verses at the end of Adhy. 50, only in the Adhy. 271–273, (and) thus finds itself in a completely foreign place and stands in no organic connection with the neighbouring chapters.[5] As this doubtful section (XIX) is short in the Mt. and as Pargiter has already pointed out,[6] older than in the Bḍ.-Vā., so the conclusion is evident that it had originally formed an independent text and had

1. The Purāṇa Text of the Dynasties of the Kali age p. XIII.

2. *Ibid.* p. XII ff.

3. *Ibid.* p. X f.

4. The 4th Book of the Vi. which treats of the Sūrya- and Somavaṁśa is, as also already seen by Pargiter, a younger prose paraphrase.

5 The preceding Adhyāya bears the signature (colophon) "*prāsādānukīrtanam*" and the following (chapter). "*tulāpuruṣadānam.*"

6. The Purāṇa Text of tha Dynasties of the Kali age p. XIII.

been first absorbed as such in the compilation of the text of the Purāṇas. After what has been said the probability that it might have moved to the right place in the Bḍ.-Vā. only through an accident, thus appears as wholly excluded and the assumption is abundently justified that the existing text material has been arranged in a definite manner by the hand of a reviser and has been partly revised as well as the approximate fixing of the year 335 as the *terminus a quo* for this activity. With this fails Pargiter's thesis that the Bḍ. and Vā. have preserved an old principle of division of the Purāṇas[1] in their fourfold division into *prakriyā anuṣaṅga*, *upodghāta* and *upasaṁhārapāda*, (and) it follows on the contrary that the compiler of the Bḍ.-Vā. has transferred the same first to the existing material.

As *terminus ad quem* for the activity of the reviser sketched above, probably also for the separation of the text-kernel of the Bḍ.-Va. in both the Purāṇas existing at present, the year 620 can be regarded from a certain reference.[2] Namely in Bāṇa's *Harṣacarita*, at III. 3 a "..... *munigītam atipṛthu......jagadvyāpi pāvanam......... purāṇam......*" is mentioned, but whether by it is meant, as has been admitted, the Vā. in its form appearing to us at present or only the text-kernel of Bḍ.-Va. or a middle member lying between both in its development towards Vā. or finally a wholly another text, cannot be decided. When in fact the separation of the original kernel has resulted through the insertion of separate passages and small interpolations characterised above in both the Purāṇas now available to us cannot be established for the time (being).

As has been already remarked above, this fixation of time does not, however, refer to all the passages of the text received into the text-kernel of the Bḍ-Vā. That many of them are actually older appears from a comparison of Bḍ-Vā. with the other Purāṇas, the result of which shall be treated of in the following.

The relation of the Purāṇas to the Bḍ-Vā. and to one another

If we now further follow our method and compare Bḍ-Vā. with the other Purāṇas, then it follows that, apart from (XX) the cases in which only two different Purāṇas exhibit parallels in a chapter or greater text-passage, with regard to three great sections more Purāṇas textually agree with one another or arrange themselves into text groups. These three sections are the Pañcalakṣaṇa, characterised

1. Ancient Indian Historical Tradition p. 23 f.
2. *Ibid.* 49.

through the themes treated of in it: *sarga*, *pratisarga*, *vaṁśa*, *manvantara* and *vaṁśānucarita*, the text-passages about cosmography and geography and the Śrāddhakalpa.[1] As far as I can now see, the activity of the reviser and of the modifier in a similar manner becomes evident in all the three cases in the Bḍ-Vā. As our further researches shall extend only to the Pañcalakṣaṇa, the apparently oldest constituent part of the whole Purāṇa literatuie, so an abstract of the same in tabular form shall first be shown, (then) how the separate Purāṇas are related to one another with regard to this section and arrange themselves into text-groups. This abstract may, at the same time, be for practical acquaintance with the whole arrangement of the printed text.

The italicised numbers will indicate that the concerning text passages do not come in question for our present exhibition or stand in another connection (in the latter cases they are underlined); if they are besides enclosed in [ ], then it signifies that they do not agree in regard to their contents with that quoted in the similar text groups. The broad faced numbers indicate those Purāṇa-sections which agree in wording or contents with each other and are taken into consideration in our exposition. A * shall indicate that the text in the concerned Purāṇa is preserved in the form of an abstract or fragmentary manner but yet with many correspondences, and a † (indicates) that the concerned Purāṇa contains only a fragment of the text; ( ) signifies that the text-passage in question is yet extant in a residual manner in the enlargement or modified text; [ ] indicates that the concerned Purāṇa presents only a simple table of contents (Ga.) or prose paraphrase (Vi.) of the section under consideration, and < > (indicates) that the mentioned verse exhibits a doublet. The young Bhg. and the Saurap. which exhibit with regard to the chapters belonging to the Pañcalakṣaṇa evidently only an abstract from the other Purāṇas and are worthless for our exhibition, are not further taken into consideration in the tabular summary.

(XXI) As the given tables give information about the condition of the sections belonging to the Pañcalakṣaṇa in the whole text of the Purāṇas under consideration, so this point is not further discussed in detail here.

Now, to be able to state as soon as possible clearly and distinctly about the texts, which the tables in the different text-groups record,

1. Both these sections will be produced in a reasonable space of time, arranged according to the principles observed in this work.

in traditional historical relation, *i,e.*, with regard to their agreement and difference in readings as well as in regard to interpolations and lacunae, a special method of collating is required. As our work limits itself to the texts belonging to the Pañcalakṣaṇa with regard to their tradition—as far as the material accessible upto now naturally permits of this—possibly to restore faithfully without trying to remove through conjecture the different difficulties resting on corruption, so the collating must proceed in such a way that by it alone the above-mentioned points spring clearly to the eye. Thence it follows, therefore, that the method, after one proceeds with it, can be not without significance for the plan and the result of this or similar work. Accordingly, I will first show by an example how the text-form attainable with the present means comes to stand. At the same time this example will lead to the reader before his eyes what in a verse appears as reliable or doubtful *i.e.*, can be esteemed as corrupt or revised, and in as much as a practical manner, will be made externally distinguishable through different types, Roman and Italic. But then it shall also explain to the reader how in a verse the complete and the partial agreement of two text-groups is brought to expression through great and small types or—and this is the case in the text-groups IIA and IIB of the first section—through interspacing. A few further instances which the reader has besides to take into consideration with regard to the external text-form have been mentioned at the end.

1.

Br. 14.16*b*	papāta	puṣpavarṣaś	ca	Śūrasya	janane	mahān.
V.	,,	,, -m	,,	,,	bhavane	,, -at[1]
H. 1924*b*	,,	,, ,,	,,	,,	,,	,, ,,
Bḍ. II. 71.147*b*	,,	,, ,,	,,	,,	,,	,, ,,
Vā. 96. 146*a*	,,	,, ,,	,,	,,	,,	,, ,,

(XXII) Hence follows the complete and sure text:

papāta puṣpavarṣaṁ ca Śūrasya bhavane mahat.

(Cfr. p. 457, Śl. 43*b*.)

2.

Br. 14.4*b*	nāsti	vyādhibhayaṁ	tatra	nāvarṣas tapam eva ca.
V.	,,	,, ,,	,,	na cāvṛṣṭibhayaṁ tathā.
H. 1909*b*	,,	,, ,,	,,	nāvarṣa- ,, -m Acyuta.
L. 69.19*b*	,,	,, ,,	,,	nāvṛṣṭi- ,, ,, apy uta.
Bḍ. II. 71.103*b*	,,	,, ,,	,,	na cāvṛṣṭi- ,, -ṁ tathā.
Vā. 96.102*b*	,,	vyādhir ,,	,,	,, ,, ,, ,, ,,

1. Very frequently one finds in the texts made use of here the more correct readings in the variants under the text.

1st SECTION

Text group I.				Text-group II a.					Text-group II b.					Text-gr. III.
Brahmap.	Harivaṃśa.	Śivap. Dharmas.	Agnip.	Garuḍap.	Padmap. 1	Padmap. 2	Varāhap.	Viṣṇup.	Märkaṇḍ.	Kūrmap.	Brahmāṇḍ.	Liṅgap.	Vāyup.	Matsyap.
[1.1—1.20]	[1—26]	[1.1—51.2]	[1.1—17.6a]	[1.1—4.3]	I. 1.1—2 83	V. 1.1—2.82	[1.1—2.20]	[I. 1.1—35]	[1.1—45.28]	[1.1—4.5]	I. 1.1—2.48	[1.1—70.2]	1.1—2.45	1.1—2.21
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3.1—24	—
1.21—30	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	I. 2.1—8	—	—	—	—	—	—
1.31—56	27—53	51.3—28	*17.6b—17	*4.4—10	I. 2.84—119	V. 2.83—117	—	I. 2.10—66	45.29—73	†4.6—66	†I. 3.1—38	70.3—66	4.5—92	2.22—4.32
—	—	—	[18.1—19.29]	—	—	—	—	—	46.1—20	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	I. 3.1—25a	V. 3.1—20a	—	I. 3.1—25	46.21—44	*5.1—23	I. 4.1—34	70.67—114	5.1—54	—
—	—	—	—	—	I. 3.25b—60a	V. 3.20b—52a	†2.21—26	I. 4.1—52	47.1—14a	†6.1—25	I. 5.1—141	70.115—195a	*6.1—79	—
—	—	—	*20.1—6	†4.14b—19	I. 3.60b—83a	V. 3 52b—75	†2.27—41	I. 5.1—24	47.14b—36	7.1—18a	I. 6.1—77	—	7.1—80	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7.18b—37	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	†4.20—35	I. 3.83b—124	V. 3.76—116	—	I. 5.25—65	48.1—45	†7.38—67	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	—	—	I. 3.125—163a	V. 3.117—153a	—	I. 6.1—41	49.1—80	—	I. 7.1—195	—	8.1—209	—
—	—	—	*20.17b—20a	†5.19—32	I. 3.163b—195a	V. 3.155b—188a	*2.43—56	I. 7.1—33	50.1—32	—	I. 8.1—66	70.195b—261a	9.1—67	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	70.324b—344	9.68—122	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	50.33—51.121	—	—	—	—	—
—	—	—	*20.20b—22	—	I. 3.196b—206	V. 3.188b—201	—	I. 8.1—13	52.1—15a	†8.1—28	I. 9.1—92	70.261b—324	10.1—67	—
—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	[I. 8.14—9.147]	—	[9.1—12.321]	—	—	10.68—26.50	—
—	—	—	*20.9—17a	5.9—18	—	—	—	I. 10.1—20	51.15b—31	*13.1—20	I. 10.1—12.53	—	27.1—29.49	—
—	-	—	—	—	I. 4.1—5.95	V. 4.1—5.108	—	[11.1—12.102]	—	[13.21—24]	13.1—36.82	—	30.1—62.70	—

(*The other tables will be printed in the next issue*)

Hence follows the reasonably sure text:

nāsti vyādhibhyaṁ tatra na cāvṛṣṭibhayaṁ tathā.

(Cfr. p. 450, Śl 3b.)

3.

Br. 13.104a	hutvāgniṁ	vidhivat	sā	tu	pavitrā	mitabhojanā.
H. 1797b	„ in	„	„	„	„ ·a-	„ „
Mt. 50.18a	„ -iṁ	„	samyak		„ -ī-kṛ-	„ „
V.	„ „	„	„	„	„ -a-	„ „ „
Vā. 99.212b	hutāgny anidrā hy abhavat			„	„ -mi-	„ „

Hence follows the text:

hutvāgniṁ vidhivat *sā tu* pavitr*a*mitabhojanā.

(Cfr. p. 549, Śl. 99b)

4.

Br. 13.157b	Bhadraśreṇyasya	dāyādo	Durdamo	nāma	viśrutaḥ
H. 1848b	„ „	„	„	„	„
Bd. II. 69.7a	„ -senasya	„	„ -mado	„	pārthivaḥ
Vā. 94.7a	„ -śreṇyasya	„	„	„ „	„
Kū. 22.17a	„ „	„	„ -damo	„	„
L. 68.7a	„ „	„	„	„ „	„
Mt. 43.11b	„ „	putro' bhūd	„	„ „	„
P.2. V. 12.115a	„ -senasya	„	„ -darśo	„	„
V.	„ „ „	„	„ -damo	„	„
P.1. I. 12.103b	„ „	„ -tras tu	„	„ „	dhārmikaḥ.

The text results:

Bhadra*śreṇy*asya dāyādo Dur*damo* nāma *pārthiva*ḥ.

(Cfr. p. 411, Śl. 7a.)

5.

Br. 15.39b	varayāmāsa	nṛpatiṁ	tām	iyeṣa	ca	sa	prabhuḥ.
H. 2008b	„	„	„	„	„	„	„
Bd. II. 71.12a	„	rājānaṁ	„	„	sa pārthivaḥ.		
Vā. 96. 11b	cinta- „	„	„	„	„	„	
Mt. 44.55b	jñāpa „	„	„	„	„	mahāvrataḥ.	
V	„ „	„	„	„	„	-hīpatiḥ.	

(XXIII)

P.1. I. 13.39b	„ „	„	„	„ nṛpas tataḥ.			
P.2. V. 13.40b	„ „	„	„	„	„	„	

The text follows:

*vara*yāmāsa *rājāna*ṁ tām iyeṣa *ca sa prabhuḥ*.

(Cfr. p. 434, Śl. 10b.)

16

6. Br. 13.14*b* Kakṣeyos tanayās tv āsaṁs traya eva mahārathāḥ.
H. 1668*b* ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,
Bḍ. II. 74.12*b* Anoś caiva sutā vīrās trayaḥ paramadhārmikāḥ.
Mt. 48.10*a* ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,
Vā. 99.12*b* Anoḥ putrā mahātmānas,, ,, ,,
Br. 13.15*a* Sabhānaraś Cākṣuṣaś ca Paramanyus tathaiva ca.
H. 1669*a* ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,
Mt. 48.10*b* ,, ,, ,, ,, -meṣus ,, ,,
Vā. 99.12*a* ,, ca Pakṣaś ,, ,, -pakṣas ,, ,,
Bḍ. II. 74.13*a* ,, Kālacakṣuḥ Parākṣaś ceti viśrutāḥ.

Since in the middle of the first half of the śloka, a text-fusion brought about through the interchange of leaves appears in Br. and H. by which the connection is broken and unhomogeneity to each other pushes in, so the text must read :

Anoś caiva sutā vīrās trayaḥ *paramadhārmikāḥ*
Sabhānaraś Cākṣuṣaś ca Param*anyus* tathiva ca.
(Cfr. p. 523, Śl. 12*b*, 13*a*)

7. Br. 7.45*b* teṣāṁ Vikukṣir jyeṣṭhas tu vikukṣitvād ayodhatām.
H. 661*b* ,, jyeṣṭho Vikukṣis ,, ,, ,,
Śidh. 60 34*a* ,, Vikukṣir jyeṣṭhas ,, so'yodhyām abhavan nṛpaḥ.
Bḍ. II. 63.9*a*,, jyeṣṭho Vikukṣis ,, Nimir Daṇḍaś ca te trayaḥ.
Vā. 88.9*a* ,, ,, ,, ṣiś ca Ne- ,, ,, ,, ,, ,,

As the Purāṇas here divide themselves into two groups, the text must read :

teṣāṁ jyeṣṭho Vikukṣis tu vikukṣitvād ayodhatām
teṣāṁ jyeṣṭho Vikukṣis *tu* Nimir Daṇḍaś ca te tryaḥ.
(Cfr. p. 308, Śl. 44*a*.)

8. Bḍ. I. 9.32*b* dvidhākṛtvā svakaṁ deham ardhena puruṣo 'bhavat
Vā. 10.7*b* ,, -ākarot sa taṁ ,, ,, ,, ,,
Kū. 8.7*a* ,, ,, punar ,, ,, ,, ,,
L. 70 267*a* ,, -ākṛtvā svakaṁ ,, ,, ,, ,,

As the corresponding verse in the text-group I. given above reads : (cfr. p. 5, Śl. 24*b*)

(XXIV) "dvidhā kṛtvātmano deham ardhena puruṣo'bhavat" in the text-group IIB it receives the form :

dvidhā kṛtvā svakaṁ deham ardhena puruṣo 'bhavat
(Cfr. p. 114, Śl. 7*b*)

9. Kū. 20.22*a*. Dṛḍhāśvasya Pramodas tu Haryaśvas tasya cātmajaḥ.
L. 65.37*a* „ „ „ „ „ vai sutaḥ.
Mt. 12.33*a* „ „-daś ca „ „ cātmajāh.
P.1. I. 8.138*b* „ „-das tu „ „ „
P.2. V. 8.137*b* „ „-daś ca „ „ „
V. „ „-das tu „ „ „

As the corresponding verse in the text-group I. given above reads: (cfr. p. 315, Śl. 90*a*)

" Dhaundhumārir Dṛḍhāśvaś ca Haryaśvas tasya cātmajaḥ "
in the text-group II. it receives the form :

Dṛḍhāśvasya Pramodas *tu* Haryaśvas tasya cātmajaḥ.
(Cfr. p. 345, Śl. 59*b*)

10. Bḍ. I. 8.47*b* ete grāmyāḥ smṛtāḥ sapta āraṇyāḥ sapta cāpare.
L. 70.240*b* etān „-yān paśūn āhur „-yān vai nibodhata.
Vā. 9.47*a* „ „ „ „ „ „-yāṁś ca „

As this verse verbally agrees with the corresponding (verse) of the similarly arranged text-group IIA (cfr. p. 28, Śl. 26*b*), so it is printed interspaced in both the text-groups in order to make this agreement outwardly discernible:

e t ā n g r ā m y ā n p a ś ū n ā h u r ā r a ṇ y ā ṁ ś c a n i b o d h a t a.
(Cfr. p. 105, Śl. 47*a*).

11. Bḍ. I. 5.30*a* sasarja sṛṣṭaṁ tadrūpaṁ kalpādiṣu yathā purā.
L. 70.139*a* „ „-ṭiṁ „-pāṁ „ „ „
Vā. 6.35*b* „ „ „ „ „ „ „ „

As the corresponding verse in the similarly arranged text-group II A reads: (cfr. p. 20, Śl. 1*a*.)

" sṛṣṭiṁ cintayatas tasya kalpādiṣu yathā purā ",
so the agreeing words in both the text-groups are inter-spaced:

sasarja sṛṣṭiṁ tadrūpāṁ k a l p ā d i ṣ u y a t h ā p u r ā.
(Cfr. p. 62, Śl. 25*b*).

12. Bḍ. I. 8.54*a*. vidyuto 'śanimeghāṁś ca rohitendradhanūṁṣi ca.
L. 70.247*a* „ „ „ „ „
Vā. 9 52*b* „ „ „ „ „

As the verse verbally agrees with the corresponding (verse) of the text-group I. given above (cfr. p. 4, Śl. 21*a*) and with the text-group IIA similarly arranged (XXV) (cfr. p. 29, Śl. 31*a*) it is printed large and interspaced in both the text-groups IIA and IIB to make

it outwardly distinguishable that both these text-groups agree with each other and with I.

v i d y u t o 'ś a n i m e g h ā ṃ ś c a r o h i t e n d r a d h a n ū ṃ ṣ i c a.
(Cfr. p. 106, Śl. 53*b*)

As can already be seen from the examples cited, the doubtful tradition as well as the agreement and difference of the different text-groups will be made distinguishable externally through different types in the following work. Finally now, all peculiarities of the external text-form, which the reader has to consider, will be briefly characterised.

1. With regard to a place of the texts in question so far separated that the tradition must be considered as doubtful, the doubtful word, syllable or letter will be made distinguishable through the Italic type.

2. The text which is in general common with the Purāṇas mentioned in text-group I. or yet, from whichever source, can be considered as belonging originally to it, is externally discernible in the large type.

3. The small type shows the text which is shown by the Purāṇas mentioned in text-groups II. and III. as well as that diverging from that of the text-group I. All verbal agreements of both these groups with I. are likewise expressed by large type.

4. All verbal agreements between both the similarly arranged text-groups II A and II B of the 1st section are distinguishable by interspaced print. The similarity applies to the agreement of the text group III. of the 3rd section with the special verses of the sub group Bḍ-Vā. of the text-group I. of the same section—e.g. p. 264 Śl. 50.38*a*, 50.39*b* and p. 282, Śl. 20*b*, 21*a* etc.—as well as to that of both the verse-groups : 2nd section, 2nd chapter, text-group I*a*, A, Śl. 137-144 (p. 185) and 3rd section, text-group III A, Śl. 25-34 (p. 280). All verbal agreements between the text-group I. on the one hand, and IIA and IIB of the 1st section on the other hand, are brought into prominence by large and at the same time interspaced type.

5. About the verbal agreements of individual verses and verse-groups within the similar text-groups, those of the verse groups : 1st section, text-group IIB, 7th chapter, Śl. 9*b*-16*a* (p. 114f) and (XXVI) 2nd section, 1st chapter, text-group I, Śl. 1. 1*b*-1.5 (p. 141) as well as finally those of both the places mentioned under 4—the reader will

be able to find that out otherwise only with difficulty—also, to indicate outwardly, side loops are employed.

6. The most important texts of group I. are Br., H. and Śidh. as far as it exists, on the one side and Bḍ. and Vā. originating from the original kernel of Bḍ.–Vā. on the other. If the texts of group I. proceed separately, (and) if this happens throughout in the course of both these sub-groups, then the varying readings of this are exhibited beside each other, separated through a middle vertical line. But about the text-group I. of the 3rd section, whose agreement in contents of the sub-group Bḍ.–Vā. notwithstanding its partial incorrectness, must not be broken, the verse form of it will be preserved. Accordingly several cases occur that do not break up the agreeing or the corresponding verse of both the sub-groups. Also in these cases the large type of the sub-group Bḍ.–Vā. refers to the fact that there are correspondences with the other sub-group (cfr. p. 262, Śl. 50.3*a* and p. 259, Śl. 45*a*; p. 262 Śl.. 50.10*b* ff. and p. 272, Śl. 82 f. and 79*b* f.)

7. The special verses of the sub-group of text-group I. mentioned under 6 are throughout made discernible through small type and vertical line[1] in front. If these special verses be considered in general also as interpolations or additions, then this method shall not indicate that in every case they must be considered as secondary constituent parts, but yet the possibility always exists that in individual cases they can be got lost in one or other sub-group. As to the 5th chapter of the 4th section, both the sub-groups coming into consideration are Mt. P.1 and P.2 on the one side and Bḍ.–Vā. on the other and their relation to one another in the outer form of the exposition is naturally brought correspondingly to expression.[2] Great and small type imply in the first text-group, on principle, thus only a means to throw into clear relief the common and the individual parts of the sub-groups.

(XXVII) 8. As the Br., *i.e.*, naturally only the part of it coming into consideration here, is specially important and probably also the Indian tradition could apply antiquity to this Purāṇa, so, in the text group I. all the verses, in which it falls short, are made

1. In the history of Yayāti (p. 387 ff,) the front vertical line is throughout omitted because some other texts also of the special parts of Bḍ.-Vā. not comprised in the sub-groups Br. and H exhibit and sometimes have readings which deviate from those of the last named sub-group and therefore these have to be placed against each other.

2 As, *e g.*, p. 483 ff. H coincides with the special passages of Bḍ -Vā. opposed to the sub-group Mt. P. it must likewise appear here in small print.

externally discernible through pushing back behind the general verse-front. (Cfr. p. 148, Śl. 31*b*; p. 155, Śl. 4*a*; p. 159, Śl. 25, etc.)

9. Through [ ] is made distinguishable not only evident lacunæ in one of the sources—*e.g.*, p. 122, Śl. 20*b* ff. etc.—but also small interpolations mostly disturbing the connection—*e.g.*, p. 3 after Śl. 13, p. 159 after Śl 22, p. 237 after Śl. 31, etc.

10. The critical apparatus, which in its whole arrangement closely corresponds to the text-form, always brings primarily into account the sources coming into consideration for the concerning verse.[3] Apart wholly from the fact that they quickly render possible the reference and proof of a passage, they also acquaint (one) of their readings if any one of those sources contains special verses or whole passages, not further considered individually in our work. Therefore these accounts supply a verse-concordance to all the texts coming into consideration. Then the apparatus collectively presents different readings with the help of which it is possible, without further ado, to further establish in a moment the special, sometimes understandable, text of the sources. Only notorious printing mistakes are not taken into account.

Now the text of the Pañcalakṣaṇa, corrected and arranged according to the preceding principles, forms to some extent the basis for our further reasoning, particularly in the historical consideration of the text. The consideration of the further scientific questions of religion, philosophy and history etc. arising from our work or connected with it, must remain in reserve for a later time already for reasons of space.

(To be continued.)

3. *a*, *b* and *c* respectively denote the half-ślokas and I and II, the two pādas of half-śloka. In the account of sources ( ) indicates that the concerning śloka or half-śloka exhibits only agreement in contents and < > that the concerning passage stands under the text. In general I give Br. in preference before H. and Bḍ. before Vā.

PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION OF ĀḶVARS: VIPRANĀRĀYAṆA OR TONDAR-ADIP-PODI ĀLVAR

(Enjoyer of the Dust of the Feet of Devotees)

BY

Dr. K. C. VARADACHARI, M.A., Ph. D.

[The contribution of the Āḻvārs to the Philosophy of India is immense and has not been so for fully assessed in a systematic manner. Dr. K. C. Varadāchari who was connected with this Institute till the middle of 1945, is deeply imbued with the subject and has already contributed articles to the Journal on several Āḻvārs. The present one is from the pen of the same scholar on one more Āḻvār who was a redeemed soul—Ed.]

INTRODUCTION

Vipranārāyaṇa, or Nārāyaṇa, the Brāhmana, who is otherwise known as Toṇḍar-adip-poḍi āḻvār (or Bhaktāṅghrireṇu in Sanskrit) had a romantic life. He was born, so says the *Guruparamparā*, in 2814 B.C.[1] in the month of Dhanus (December-January) under the lunar asterism Jyeṣṭhā, in the village of Tiru-maṇḍaṅguḍi. He was brought up as a devout Brāhmaṇa and initiated in the Vedic scriptures. He grew and undertook the vocation of serving God by making garlands for Him. For this purpose he grew a well-nurtured beautiful flower garden. When he was spending his life thus, romance came to him in an unexpected manner.

There was in that place a beautiful dancing girl (*veśyā*), Devadevī by name, who was attending to her duties at the palace of the local chieftain. One day, when she was returning to her house, the day being very hot, she, along with her companion, sat under the shade of the trees in the garden of Vipranārāyaṇa. She was admiring the wonderful ability of the gardener and learnt from her companion that the garden belonged to Vipranārāyaṇa, a very devout devotee of God who would not look at any woman. But the *veśyā* being conscious of her accomplishments in the art of enticement and seduction of the opposite sex, vowed to make the brahmin her victim within six months or else to become a servant of her companion. Thus a mutual agreement between herself and her companion was entered into for making the brahmin fall off from his devout life. Next day Devadevī

1. *Ancient India:* [by Dr, S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar] p. 404. The historical date assigned is the seventh century, A.D.

donning very plain clothes approached the saintly Vipranārāyaṇa He was lost in the work of God. After some time she prostrated before him and narrated to him her story, that she was a dancing girl and seized with a desire to serve God and get away from that hereditary life to which she was born she had approached him. She offered to work in the garden and tend the plants and water the trees. The innocent saint accepted her offer, and permitted her to do such service as she could do. Some months thereafter one day there was a heavy downpour of rain. The saint went into his hut. He saw Devadevī, who was standing outside, being drenched. He asked her to enter the hut, and as she was completely wet he gave his own upper cloth to her to wear. Then alone did his mind turn outwards, and gazing at her attractive form and beauty and seductive looks he fell in love with her. The victory was won by Devadevī and her vow was fulfilled. Thereafter his passion for her took its determined ruthless course. He began neglecting his duties to the temple, his brahmanic duties were slowly given up; his one and only absorption was this woman; slowly all his property was lost in feeding the infatuation, and having become poor in all ways, he was turned out of her house. Yet his infatuation for her did not lessen.

It was under such circumstances that the Lord (Śrīraṅganātha) and Mother Lakṣmī took pity on his condition and wished to rescue him from his fatal infatuation for a woman of ill-fame. Taking one of His golden vessels used for performing worship to Him, the Lord went to the house of Devadevī and called out to her saying that He, Azhakiyamaṇavālan, servant of Vipranārāyaṇa, had brought a golden cup to her from him. She took it from him, not knowing that it was God Himself. Soon after she sent word to Vipranārāyaṇa to come and be with her, and he with undiminished infatuation for her ran up to her shamelessly.

Next morning the temple priests did not find the golden vessel in the *sanctum sanctorum*. A search was started. The companion of Devadevī reported to one of the servants of the local chief that Vipranārāyaṇa sent to Devadevī a golden vessel the previous night. The servants then seized the golden vessel from Devadevī and marched both Devadevī and Vipranārāyaṇa to the chief's presence. At the hearing of the case, Devadevī asserted that Vipranārāyaṇa sent through a servant of his, by name Azhakiyamaṇavālan, the golden vessel. But Vipranārāyaṇa denied it and said than he had no servant at all, not to speak of having one Azhakiyamaṇavālan as his servant.

The judgment was reserved for the next day. That night in a dream Azakiya-maṇavālan (Śrīraṅganātha) told the chief that all this was His work and it was He who delivered the golden vessel to the woman, and thus humiliated both that woman and Vipranārāyaṇa. He told him that that was sufficient reformatory punishment, for what is there worse than loss of honour to man? The woman was also asked to be exonerated, as she too had learnt the lesson that she should not tempt saints. The saint was therefore next morning released, as also the woman.

The saint, having been publicly humiliated, and learning that it was due to the grace of God, which he did not deserve, that he was released from more severe punishment, and rescued from the life of sexuality and folly into which he had sunk, and fully seized with the sense of guilt and sinfulness, undertook to serve the feet of the devotees of God and purify himself with the dust and water of their feet.[1] The name *Tondar-aḍip-poḍi* means this and it was assumed by him. Thus purified by the dust of their feet, he began to serve the Lord as he was doing previously. He developed *para-bhakti* and attained the status of an enjoyer of God's love of infinite attributes, an āḷvār.

The life of the āḷvār above given is the traditional version. It reveals that even though one might be very learned in sacred lore and performing service to God in the most sāttvika way, the lower vital life is likely to invade it and storm it with terrible fury. Under such circumstances God's grace alone can retrieve the soul and purify it. The āḷvār's verses in the *Tirumālai* from 23 to 40 reveal in a nutshell his own story. The service of the feet of the devotees of the Lord without displaying any irreverance to those of them born in lower castes is finely intimated in the verses 39 and 42. The āḷvār counsels the necessity of seeing God in His devotees whoever they are. The meaning of the word 'outcaste' seems to be something different from our modern meaning, for it means one who does not see the Godhead in His devotees *(adiyārs)*. The āḷvār always remembers the story of the emancipation from great danger of Gajendra as illustrating the easy accessibility and *ārjava*-nature of God. The wearing of the name of

I. *Mahābārata* :—Nirapekṣam muniṁ śāntaṁ nirvairaṁ samadarśanam
Anuvrajāmy ahaṁ nityam pūye yetyaṅghrireṇubhiḥ
Brahmāṇḍa purāṇa :—Yasya mūrdhni sthitaṁ yāvad vaiśṇavāṅghrirajaś
śubham Gaṅgādī sarvatīrthāni tāvat tiśṭhanty asamśayam
Bhāradvāja saṁhitā :—Etat samastapāpānām prāyaścittam manīṣibhiḥ
Nirṇītam bhagavad-bhakta-pādodakaniṣevanam.
(These quotations are from the *Guruparamparā*).

God, Kaṇṇan, Kṛṣṇa, Nārāyaṇa, is equivalent to the utterance of the death-abolishing mantra; it is *mṛtyuñjaya-mantra* It is also the mantra of liberation and attainment of the highest *puruṣārtha*, namely *kaiṅkarya* of God. Devotees of God are set on the royal road to fullest enjoyment of God's nature, and the bliss and the beauty of the Divine incarnate everywhere. They must assist one another and learn of each other the glory and wonderful mystery of the Divine Lord, the omni-pervading beneficence (*bodhayantaḥ parasparam* of the *Gītā*).

The āḻvār has left two works, *Tirumālai*, the Sacred Garland of Hymns, and *Tiruppaḷḷiyezhucci*, Songs of the Morning of which translations are given in this article. The āḻvār himself is stated to be an *aṃśa* of the garland of God, *Vaijayantī*. The story goes that *Vaijayantī* is the *Vaiṣṇavī-astra* which is capable of destroying every thing and every one. Murā was destroyed by it, and the story of Bhagadattavadha in the *Mahābhārata: Droṇa parvan*, shows that God wears this most powerful weapon as His garland and that He had given it to Naraka at the request of Mother Earth and that it was then returning back to Him. The āḻvār indeed considers his composition to be such a wonderful weapon, useful for attaining immortality and Ānanda, triumph over sinfulness and attainment of the vision and the knowledge and the service of God.

TIRUMĀLAI.

1. O Lord who art residing at Śrīraṅgam, O Thou First Being (Cause) who protectest the three worlds within Thyself during dissolution and throwest them out of Thyself (at the time of creation) ! By learning (to practise) Thy Name the senses and the sinful objects of those are restrained[1], and having gone beyond and in a challenging attitude we have placed our feet on the heads of Yama (Death) and his hosts.

2. O Lord of Śrīraṅgam ! I do not wish it, even if I get, the taste of the blessed rule of the Indraloka in preference to the taste of fervently addressing Thee here ever as Oh ! Acyuta possessing the graceful body likened to a splendid green mountain, the mouth likened to the

1. Cf. *Kaṭhopaniṣad*, I.3.10.-11. : *Indriyebhyaḥ parā hy arthāḥ*......

2. *Acyuta*: the unfailing, undeteriorating, undiminishing. This is the name of the most perfect Being. It also means that He does not permit any of His devotees to fall or slip or slide back into ignorance, or sin of sleep.

red coral, rosy eyes likened to the lotus, O Ruler of the Celestials and O tender chieftain of the cowherds !

3. Even though man's age according to the Veda be hundred years, half of it will be passed in sleeping; and the remainder of fifty years is spent as a baby, boy, youth, in disease and hunger, old age and grief. Therefore I seek not this kind of birth, O Lord gracious of Śiraṅgsm !

(Āḷvār addresses others)

4. Standing in the encircling sins, even Kṣatrabandhu by uttering the three lettered name of Thine (Govinda) attained the supreme status. Lo ! even though knowing that our superb loving Lord of Śrīraṅgam descends (to save) the devotees who do this much alone uttering His name, unheeding are men caught up in birth.

5. How can those low men who seeking to enjoy the pleasures with women, gain great sorrow, eat during nights and live, abandoning these vile ways, think only of their self with mind surrendered, become slaves of the Lord wearing Śrī on His chest, with cool Tulasi-garland, and sing and dance and attain the status of a complete dependent (on Him) and enjoy the Nectar (immortality-bliss) ?

6. Having cruelty as a wall within and thus attaining the poverty of Heaven, and having this perishable body as the outer cover, Ye men, ye know not the hour of your death.

Not doing service to the Lord of Śrīraṅgam who is the

3. *Śatāyuḥ* or *śatamāna* indicates the normal span of human life on this planet. The following śloka appears to be an identical expression of the above hymn:

Āyur varṣaśataṁ nrṇāṁ parimitaṁ rātrau tadardhaṁ gatam
Tasyārdham parasya cārdham aparam bālatva-vṛddhatvayoḥ
Seṣam vyādhi-viyoga-duḥkha-sahitaṁ sevādhibhīr nīyate
Jīve vāritaraṅgacañcalatare saukhyaṁ kutaḥ prāṇinām.

4 Birth means birth-death cycle, or as intimated in the previous hymn, a round of sleep and disease, and misery and old-age or imbecility.

5. The abandonment of sexual life and riot of the senses for the sake of pleasure is deprecated as obstacles to perfection. These are prāpti - virodhis.

6 The cruelty herein referred to is the sacrificial cruelty, as the performance of these sacrifices of animals leads to heavenly enjoyment according to the śāstras. And the perishability of the body is stated here in order to point out that the pleasure-hunt is due to dēhātmabbrama - delusion that the body is the soul. Real poverty is lack of God's service.

wall of Dharma, ye remain decorating your exterior for birds to prey upon (without caring for your interior).

7. Those good knowers of the scriptures will they care to learn or hear Buddhist and Śramaṇa doctrines that teach the false dharma? Even though my head is cut off, I shall not die. This is truth. Know. The God who conquered Lanka with His bow is alone the supreme Godhead.

8. Disgusted, the Śramaṇas (Cārvākas), Muṇḍas (Jainas), ill-fated Śākyas (Buddhists) speak intolerable words in respect of Thee, that become insufferable; to me if I should attain my wish (then and) there it would be my duty to cut off their heads.

9. O ignorant men, is there any other godhead when dissolution occurs to save you? (Who worship other gods) will not be able to know Him as the One Supreme Being, who can save. The Being taught by Vedic knowledge ye will not know.

There is no God other than He (Lord of Śrīraṅgam) (to save). (Therefore) seek refuge at the feet of the Lord, our Father, the grazier of the herd.

10. (The Lord) has established gods in all places. Out of His incomparable Love to all those who seek liberation He has revealed Himself in the temple of Śrīraṅgam. O men of God! Hearken: when there is the Garuḍa-rider (to give everything including liberation) will any one seek to get riches from Jyeṣṭhādevī - the goddess of misfortune.

7. The original has Śāven, "I am prepared to die" but the comm. Periya Vacchān Pillai has Sākēn, "I shall not die because I am immortal"

7. and 8. refer to the doctrines that there is no soul, or that the body is the soul or rather the size of the soul is that of the body. The Śākyas are called ill-fated, because they know the greatness of God and yet are unable to seek refuge in Him and are unable to get His grace. The ālvār's bitterness is great.

9. This Verse has obviously a reference to the vision of Vaṭa-patra-śāyi by Sage Mārkaṇḍeya: Nārāyaṇa alone was then: He is the Cause and End.

10. The gods are the dik-pālakas and others who have been assigned their respective places in the quarters and planes and worlds. Men seek fruits of these gods according to their desires. Liberation however is capable of being granted only by the Lord at Śrīraṅgam Nārāyana Himself. He has Śrī, fortune, in His chest. Others are those who give misfortune because the true fortune is liberation from *saṁsāra*, utter uprooting of misery and attainment of the nectar of immortality,

11. With His unique bow (as weapon) having built a bridge across the raging ocean, He slew the king of the rākṣasas in battle so as to save the worlds! O Ye who are devoid of grace while in womb, and do not utter about our Lord residing in the *sanctum* of the great temple in high-walled Śrīraṅgam, are wasting your time (without seeking His refuge).

12. When the denizens of Naraka heard the conversation between Yama and Mudgala, that Naraka itself came to be thought of as Svarga due to having become filled with the Names of God!

But because these ignorant men forgetting that His place is Śrīraṅgam and His names, having fallen, are caught up in sorrow, am I distressed.

13. All dwellers of this earth surrounded by the vast scented ocean, if only these men though lacking the knowledge for praising the Lord of celestials wearing the fragrant tulasī-flower garland, would but utter 'Śrīraṅgam', then the entire Naraka in which the senses are caught will disperse.

14. From the mouths of the foolish men who do not utter the name 'Śrīraṅgam' that has gardens where honey-bees are humming, where peacocks are dancing, whose tree-tops are approached and touched by clouds' and

11. The story referred to is that of *darbha-śayanam* when Rāma threatened to make the ocean dry if the ocean did not make way. Without seeking the grace of God, one cannot gain His grace. Surrender to God is all.

12. Mudgala-Yama-saṁvāda: *Viṣṇu-dharma.* Heaven is where the name of God prevails. And hell is purified and mortality is extinguished, and sorrows are banished by the mere utterance of God's names

13. Śolai is flower-garden or forest. The temple-city of Śrīraṅgam, indeed all places where *Viṣṇu* resides, are surrounded by excellent gardens and forests. The *Kenopaniṣad* instructs the meditation on the Lord-Supreme power as *Vana* or *Tad-Vana,* and Srī Raṅgarāmānuja renders it as *vananīya* or *varaṇīya*, the most electable and the most excellent (variṣṭa, śreṣṭa)

14. *Īśā* 4: cf. Venkatanātha's commentary. God is afar to those who are looking outward and away from Him, and near to those who are turning towards Him. God is near to those who love Him or have *sneha-bhāva* and have no *dveṣa* or hatred or revulsion. The doubt which the Divine dispels is with reference to the means and ways of arriving at Him and the getting rid of the obstacles. The Divine is the way and the means to the goal which is Himself, and indeed He is also the remover of all obstacles to the attainment of Himself.

where Indian Cuckoos make love-calls to one another, and where the Lord of celestials resides, do you forcibly remove the food they are greedily eating and give it to the dogs!

15. The Lord who has the Garuḍa as His flag is true to those who are truthful: to those who are untruthful like me, is He untrue.

To those who are seeking to become regenerate, He Himself, after granting the knowledge that He is the only One person, cuts asunder the doubts by revealing the beautiful city of Śrīraṅgam.

16. At the time when I was a gambler and a thief and, caught in the net of a women's fish-like eyes, was helpless, was it not the Beauty of Śrīraṅgam who called me, entered into my mind, and made my love increase for Him?

17. Though standing respectfully, I was not singing praises nor folding my hands, not knowing that there was one supreme Lord; so that my hard mind could like iron be melted little by little, the sugar-like Lord who had taken up residence in the great Śrīraṅgam surrounded by gardens where bees are humming, has become the Object of mine eyes.

18. In the midst of the shining cool waters where the beating waves sound pleasantly, the lotus-eyed Lord is staying as ruler:

15. The reference is to his own story when he was seduced into making love to the maiden who wanted to acquire his property by pretending to be devoted to God and at first assisted him in the making of his garlands.

16. The grace of God who sought to rescue him from his pathetic position when he was arrested for the theft of a gold vessel from the temple, made it possible for him to realize the love of God to man and it was this that melted him and made him a lover athirst for God's vision.

17. The passionate love for God is here expressed by the āḷvār who complains about the interference from the eyes which had always been interfering since they were always directed outwards. Now the tears are interfering, though not the eyes.

18. The melting of the mind is the process or movement towards losing oneself in the Divine; it is not a collapse of the mind but the process of intuiting, of knowing that coincides with being in the depths. The resistance is broken, the solidity of the ego is impaired permanently through the heat of love, *tapas* or concentration, and the identity of private being yields place to the realization of oneness with the Lord who becomes the abode of the soul, and himself the abode of the Lord. There is fusion of

On beholding His loving red lips and eyes, cool tears of delight flowing copiously from mine eyes have, alas, prevented me from enjoying more of Him. Unblessed me! What shall I do?

19. Seeing the Lord of the colour of the ocean, resting on the serpent having placed His crowned head to the Eastern direction and His feet to the Western direction, showing His back to the North and gazing at Laṅkā in the Southern direction, my soul has begun to melt. O dwellers of the earth, what shall I do?

20. If the devotees but perceive the wonderful person in Śrīraṅgam surrounded by the flowing waters (of Kāverī) lying on the serpent, His chest adorned by Śrī, His body like the emerald and His shoulders, His eyes like the pure lotuses, His lips red and His mouth like the coral, and His crown long and glorious, and the general effulgence, they would grow vast (big).

21. If the mind which from beginningless time has been going towards other things is directed towards the

God and man. Devotion to the Lord, concentric and integral helps this melting, fusion, interpenetration.

19. It is the Lord that possesses and not the ego. The heating agent is God's beauty, its attractiveness is grace - beneficent, the subjective nearness to God achieves the flow of the soul to the ocean of God. Recalling the Upaniṣadic simile the rivers flow to the ocean but rivers flow to the ocean only when there is the rainfall of Grace or from having their source in some perennial source. The Grace has the colour of the rain-cloud: Kṛṣṇa indeed is Meghavarṇa. It is the rain-fall that clears the silt and the debris that are washed along with the waters to the ocean or sea.—" Fire indeed becomes water " thanks to God's grace. The soul becomes vast or big with delight, it becomes *pūrṇa* with joy or *ānanda* of having known the enticing beauty of God.

20. The mind must be directed godward and must enter into Him in order to understand the meaning of the Arcā-descent. The purpose of the divine descent as the Lord resting in sleep of Yoga or concentration, which is said to be the state of transcendent awareness of the needs and evolution of the souls, is one of deepest love; cf. *Droṇa parvan* 29, 32-4 (XXIX 24-26) M. N. Dutt's. Trans.

Kṛṣṇa tells Arjuna (Bhagadatta Vadha):—

" Caturmūrtir aham śaśval lokatrāṇārtham udyataḥ
Ātmānam pravibhajyeha lokānām hitam ādadhe.
Ekamūrtis tapaścaryām kurute me bhuvi sthitā
Apara paśyati jagatkurvāṇam sādhyasādhunī.
Aparā kurute karma mānuṣam lokam āśritā
Śete caturthī tv aparā *nidrām varṣasahasrikīm*..

21. No one can even understand the glory and greatness affirmed of Him unless one has turned away from falsity and has taken refuge in Him.

coral-red lipped Lord of Śrīraṅgam in submission, then it is possible for that mind to know the wonderful purpose (manner) of the resting of the emerald-hued Lord in the beautiful golden Meru-like temple in Śrīraṅgam.

22. The statements (of Śrutis about the Lord) are but statements about just a portion of His greatness; except for those who have turned away from falsity, incapable is He of being known.

O poor mind! Say thou whether the hymns sung by us who have surrendered ourselves to Him who dwells in those who have sought refuge in Him wholly and live and experience Him, are adequate?

23. Though having perceived our loving supreme Master God, resting wonderfully in the temple surrounded by gardens at Śrīraṅgam set in the midst of the flowing waters of Kāverī, purer than Gaṅgā, I am living forgetting Him. Poor me! Poor me!!

24. In the temple of Śrīraṅgam surrounded on all sides by gardens watered by the floods (of Kāverī), though having seen the resting posture, the lotus-eyes and lustrous face of the Lord, O mind, you have not known that He is the One (without a second). You are making false devotion and in that falsehood you are spending your life-time.

25. I have lost the brahminhood that comprises in bathing and worshipping the three fires without any faults in performance: nothing is it to me; but in respect of Thee have I become bereft of love: with what shall I, O perfect Lord! O Lord of ocean's colour! O Lord

22. God has come to the earth but man has not gone to Him or even cried out to Him. The Divine has come in all His four forms and has even rested Himself so that He could be approached and even spoken to as when Arjuna and Duryodhana approached Srī Kṛṣṇa when he was asleep at Dvārakā He who chooses wisely like Arjuna always gets his success. *Mahābhārata* : Virāta parvan)

23. False devotion is devotion for the sake of worldly benefits, not for the sake of the ultimate deliverance from ignorance and *saṁsāra* and for total attainment of the vision and service of the Divine

24. Even the loss of Brahminhood is as nothing compared to the falling off from the love of God. The āḷvār having been enticed away by the beautiful looks of the damsel lost his love to Him aad lost his brahminhood, and was outcasted. But the latter is as nothing compared to the deviation in love. The āḷvār cries out to God to restore his love to Himself. *Avyabhicāriṇī-buddhi* is the necessity.

dweller in Śrīraṅgam! do? I am imploring Thee with loud cries. "Make me thine object of mercy and deliver me."

26. I am not spending all my time in offering flowers at Thy golden feet:

I am not speaking faultless words describing Thine auspicious qualities:

Nor have I even connected my mind lovingly with Thee:

Therefore nothing have I done to Thee O Lord of Śrīraṅgam. For what purpose then have I been born?

27. When the monkeys were lifting and carrying mountains to build the bridge across the sea, the small and tender squirrels carried particles of sand by bathing in the sea and rolling on the sand and bathing again! I am not like them even.

I who am an ignorant being like the trees, hard in the mind deceitful and not doing any service, am getting lost!

28. The Lord of Light, incomprehensible to Brahma, and other gods, came running in anger against the crocodile that feeds on red flesh, for the sake of (saving) the elephant.

Have we (who have placed ourselves at His feet) any burden in respect of saving ourselves?

Why am I born without doing service to Him, our

25. Though the individual soul is not perfect. the Divine Lord takes it up and leads it, though the individual soul feels that it had not done anything to deserve such grace. Therefore arises a thirst for doing service to God as a recognition of His Grace and as a sign of its gratitude.

26. Thus observing the doings of even the tiniest and weakest of creatures doing service to God he also tries to do his mite to God out of gratitude. Thus *gratitude* is sign of free worship and *kaiṅkarya.*

27. The Lord to whom we have offered ourselves or at whose feet we have surrendered has to be served and remembered but the soul is unable to do the same due to external attractions.

28. The story refer to the exploit of God who rescued the soul (Gajendra) caught by the crocodile (wiles of *saṁsāra*). The reference to dogs is to animals which are lowliest; it typifies the *vāsanas* of greed and love of carnal food even like the crocodiles. They enter every door uninvited. The *Gītā* teaches that the seer sees the dog, the untouchable, the saint and all with an equal eye.]

Master, our Saviour, who sees not faults of our's who are like dogs.

29. I have no place nor plot of ground, nor relatives, nor friends:
On this earth I have not attained thine lotus-feet.
O Supreme Godhead, O luminous cloud-hued Form,
Kaṇṇa! I implore Thee Lord resident at Śrīraṅgam!
Who else have I except Thee to protect me?

30. In my mind there is no purity,
In my mouth no words of affection have I.
In anger I utter words of piercing insult.
O Lord wearing the fragrant garland of *tulasī* residing in Śrīraṅgam surrounded by the river (ponni: Kāverī),
O Master, who have me as Thine slave! Hereafter tell me as to what way is open to me.

31. Nor do I belong to the society of *tapasvins*;
Nor to the wealthy class; nor am I anything to my relatives like brackish water;
Having become enslaved by the crimson-lips of ladies
I have become a knave;
O Lord of Śrīraṅgam! Thou hast in vain given me this birth!

32. O Kaṇṇa, having a body like grouping clouds! Thou who residest in the beautiful Śrīraṅgam surrounded by groves where bees are humming tunes!
Knowing not any means to attain Thee, I have become a knave among men and stubborn. Stubborn am I! Stubborn am I!

29. Place here refers to a place sanctified by God's presence in the past or present, such as in Brindāvana or Sālagrāma or Ayodhyā or Śrīraṅgam.

30. With all their faults and frailties the Lord loves His slaves, and makes them whole. The Lord is the means to the ultimate destiny, the fullest and purest enjoyment of the Divine Lord Himself in all His majesty and incomparable radiance and power, and delight and truth.

31. The āḷvār reveals his abasement and humility, and his distaste for his selfish relatives, and yet his own condition is none so good as to be fit for one-pointed attention on God alone.

32. The knavery of the individual is due to his seeking all pleasures for himself, Theft is defined as the taking of things that belong to another, here the Divine, without His having given them out of His grace. The triple mention of the stubbornness on his part is both for emphasis as well as for mentioning the triple kinds of stubbornness in mind, speech and body.

33. Having let go all that is true and having got fully caught in the snares of women, I have become shameless, O Master, Lord of Śrīraṅgam!

Out of desire for Thine grace have I come and stood before Thee. Alas false am I, false am I, false am I!!

34. Not having the knowledge of the ever-indwelling Lord in my heart, I have become ignorant.

I too became Thine willing-slave, pretending devotion; knowing that Thou knowest by Thine indwelling, all the thoughts of devotees, I was ashamed and laughed within myself to the extent of my ribs being broken.

35. My Lord who once for all assumed the rulership of the worlds by covering it (with thine feet)! None other than Thee O red lotus-eyed God! will I sērve.

(My) Breath! (My) Nectar! O my Master indwelling within me as self! Sinner that I am, I shall not think at all of any other but Thee.

36. Lord who lifted up a mountain and protected the cowherds and cows from terrible rain!

O Lord of the river of sweetness (Madhurā)!

Thou art going away without looking at me, who am struggling caught in the net of the deer-like eyes of damsels! O primeval person! Dweller in Śrīraṅgam! It is Thee I am calling out to (to release me from the net).

33. The triple mention of falsity on the part of himself is also to be construed in a triple manner as in the previous verse.

34. Some wear the name of God and assume his form also, as Pauṇḍarīka Vāsudeva in the *Bhāgavata* seems to have done, but they do not become omniscient. They do not know the temple where He resides. God is the indwelling Lord, whom one has always as a treasure in one's heart. This consciousness must become continuous, concentric, and then alone one will perceive the truth of His existence as all-indweller: *Gītā* XVIII 61 and 62.

35. *Seviyen unnai yallāl*: Losing Thee, only myself and others remain and in neither do I find any possibility of union. These two are expressed by the second letter *(U)* of the *pranava* and by the middle word *(Namaḥ)* in the Mūla mantra. Due to the instinct for dependence *(śeṣatva)*, even though separation from matter ceases and others, yet there is service to be done as duty, *dharma*, and as an expression of one's eternal gratitude for the Divine who has made one perfect in His light; truth and delight.

36. The reference is to the exploit of the lifting up of the Govardhana Hill and the humiliation of Indra.

37. The supremely effulgent person residing in the temple at Śrīraṅgam girt by the muddy waters (of Kāveri) is my father and mother too! Has He not to remove my distress from me saying "This our boy is fit to be helped out"? This my saviour does not say. Alas! Is it His nature only to hear the cries of grief?

38. O Lord who resides in Śrīraṅgam girt by waters (of the Kāverī). It appears Thou appreciatest those who after giving up the materialistic view of things know rightly the truth (of the soul), learn that service (to thee) is the end to be sought, (and) controlling firmly their five senses, cutting themselves away from every other means and abolishing the wrong ways in themselves stand at Thine gateway (seeking refuge).

39. Than those who have practised the Vedas without remembering that thine service is the goal, is it not better to be born in the lowest caste with service (to Thee)?

O Thou wearer of the *tulasī* on thy crown! O Lord of Śrīraṅgam! Does not the service of Thine feet by Thine slaves bring delight to Thee?

40. Lord who having Śrī and Śrīvatsa on the chest resides in Śrīraṅgam! Even though all the earth-dwellers

37. The āḻvār cries out to the Lord who appears as if he did not hear the cries.

38. The commentators consider that the verse 38 is the *crucial* verse. It is stated that it gives the meaning of the *dvaya-mantra*—"Sriman Nārāyaṇacaraṇau śaraṇam aham prapadye Śrīmate Nārāyaṇāya." In the *dvaya, the prāpakam* is put first and *prāpyam* afterwards. In this verse the *prāpyam* is stated first and then the *prāpakam*. Nammāḻvār is stated to have meditated on the first part of the *dvaya*, Āṇḍāl is stated to have practised the second part of the *dvaya*. This āḻvār practises them together. Man has three states of ignorance: loss of the knowledge of God due to continuous absorption in things enjoyable to the senses (*melezhundaporal*); incapacity to get rid of the view that his soul is identical with his body (*mevinaporul*): and thirdly the view that those whom one has attained are omniscient. Thus one has to get rid of the thought that body and soul are identical, that the material things related to or feeding the body are one's own and that the soul though different from the body is independent of God (*svatantra*). The individual soul is distinct from its body and the supreme Godhead, it is independent of its body but dependent on the Godhead.

39. The āḻvār considers that service of God is better than mere Vedic knowledge; it does not mean that Vedic knowledge is not valuable, but even Vedic knowledge must be seen to instruct that the service of God's feet is the goal of all knowledge.

40. The constant remembrance of God within oneself is the surest cure and means of emancipation from sins and sorrows due to *sañcita* and *prārabdha* Karma.

are having world-quaking sins, if they keep Thee in their hearts firmly, then they will not experience the results of those sinful acts.

41. Even if they be cruel and torture others, if they would but address Thee (as) "O Dweller Eternal in the supreme abode, incapable of being known even by the celestials, O Thou wearer of the honey-laden *tulasī* garland on thy crown", and offer to Thee lovingly nectar-like food, then by itself they would become sinless.

42. Thou, Lord of Śrīraṅgam of high walls hast instructed thus: O Ye, who follow the traditional knowledge of the four Vedas faultlessly! even though my devotees of the Feet (*adiyārs*) are born of the lowliest caste, tell them the highest truths, and learn from them, (for) they are my equals (at least).

43. Though they be born of the Brāhman-caste, supreme among thine devotees, learned fully in the four Vedas and their excellent six subsidiaries (*aṅgas*), if they speak disrespectfully of thine devotees of other castes, then that very instant they would become outcastes! O Lord of Śrīraṅgam!

44. While He of the matted locks in which is flowing the lady (Gaṅgā), and Brahman (the fourfaced) unable to know

41. The sincere prayer to the Lord as the supremest Being and Person, the primal cause, is necessary.

42. This important hymn refers to the secret word of God to the devotees to worship, adore and mutually instruct (*bodhayanti parasparam*) each other without any difference of caste, for all are devotees of the feet of God. His service is all important, and the realization is God dwells in those who one-pointedly serve Him alone. These devotees are not *more than* Himself, but they indeed manifest Him because they constantly live and move and have their being in Him.

43. The āḻvār then adds his own indictment against those who do otherwise against the instruction given by God.

44. The Lord is difficult to achieve and know fully through knowledge (*jñāna*); for His supreme powers exceed all celestial comprehensions. But that does not prevent His running to the succour of the poor elephant caught by foot by the ravenous crocodile. The āḻvār points out that these two contradictory attributes are possible. The difficulty of the former approach is there. But the latter is quicker: seek God's refuge, perform *śaraṇāgati*, *prapatti*, become *akiñcana* holding to nothing else except the Supreme Godhead, then sinlessness, deliverance, and goodness are assured. But there are other mansions in God's Universe and personality. Knowledge is helped if it is sanctified by surrender and becomes fulfilled gradually. Knowledge must be sought for the sake of divine service alone and divine enjoyment. Veṅkaṭanātha thus

Thy full nature, for a very long time performed askesis and not realizing Thee stand, Thou wentest to save the elephant caught by the crocodile even as the eternals were looking on with wonder.

O hard-hearted Lord ! What is the means to attain Thee who art thus ?

45. These hymns on Kaṇṇan, who slew the mad-huge elephant in Mathura-city, which had very beautiful and silver-white palatial buildings, and who is now residing at Śrīraṅgam, who is the lover of His devotees, done by Tondar-adip-podi who does service by making *tulasī*-garlands for the Lord, even if they have faults in poesy, indeed will please the Lord !

TIRUPPALLI YEZHUCCI
OR
THE SONG OF WAKING UP THE LORD
(SONGS OF THE MORNING)

INTRODUCTION

The āḻvār Toṇḍar-aḍip-poḍi composed these songs of the morning hour–*suprabhātam*–to wake up the Lord in the temple. The Lord is never asleep; for His sleep or resting means fullest action, it is superb action that is imbedded in the outer poise of absolute silence in the image (*arcā*) and in addition the pose of the Lord is that of resting, what some interpreted rather naively "after having created the worlds the Lord retired to rest." The Lord on the contrary in this supreme pose of Śānti, peace, celestial and divine, denoted by the *suṣupti* is one of supreme awareness *prajñā*, a supreme absorption in the welfare of the creatures and intent on saving the souls wallowing in the mire they have settled in and the waves that they have aroused. The Lord is stationed at the very centre of the individual and the universe, in the temple at Śrīraṅgam and in the souls of all devotees (*adiyārs*). The souls are offered also an opportunity of showing their gratitude to the Lord who in all ways is absorbed in the work of redeeming them, and making them realise that they are indeed of Him. And if they would but turn inward with but an utterance of Name

promised that all are fit for *prapatti*. But *prapatti* can indeed be the constant companion of the other Yogas such as *bhakti*. *karma*, and *jñāna* which are for those who had become fitted for undertaking them in the ordained manner. They become divinised, and god-directed, and exist for God's delight and fulfilment alone.

they could enjoy the blessedness even here on this very earth where they had created all sorts of misery for themselves directed by their ignorance, illusion of the senses, and their craving for independence from God. There is in God neither fatigue nor frailty, neither impotence nor inconscience; He neither wants man's service nor man's prayer. But since it is the only way by which the individual soul can find himself in Him and get freed from his own inconscience, ignorance, misery, fatigue, frailty, sin and sorrow, he is granted an occasion to show his relationships to the Lord, through devotion, *bhakti*, *śraddhā*, and *prapatti*, surrender or speech of submission. *Kaṅkarya*, the service of God which is an expression of one's gratitude to God for His everlasting mercy (*dayā*) in relating Himself with the individual soul, a condescending act of Grace, can be of all kinds, spiritual, psychical, mental, vital and physical, *ātmika*, *mānasika* *vācika* and *kāyika*,

The ordinary man considers that all worship in the temples is but the enacting of the play, just a symbolic expression and even a humanised representation of the gratitude and loyalty and supreme oneness too. They could even be considered to be just a drama which might have no reality but pleasure for us. It was asked by one writer why not, why should not one imagine the Divine in the *saguṇa* form and worship Him everywhere? The question is not that. The āḷvārs as a rule felt that when they were offering worship to the Lord in the temple and performing such routine duties, *kainkarya*, such as singing of *suprabhātam* etc. they were by no stretch of imagination just dramatizing; they were supremely conscious that the *arcā* or icon they worshipped was indeed a divine descent for the sake of saving the souls and out of His infinite condescension the Lord had assumed a Form adorable and comforting to the individual, a Form and Personality that could help the spiritual progress of the soul and lead it to the understanding of the inexhaustible infinity of the divine Nature by transmuting it in the flame of divine desire for complete absorption in His beauty, truth and personality. The *arcā* does not cease to be adorable at any time, does not become just a symbol whose purpose ceases when the inner light of the *antaryāmin* has begun to appear and direct, nor does it vanish as a mere image when a great world-reforming and shaping Descent occurs, nor does it fail to be inspiring and guiding when one has transcended the world process represented by the knots of creation, preservation and destruction of individual life *Brahma-granthi*, *Viṣṇu-granthi* and *Rudra-granthi* within oneself.

On the contrary, the *arcā* gains greater luminosity and meaning and power of Grace at each step of the realization of the intra-individual and cosmic manifestations of the Deity. There happens a supreme integration of the personalities of these four forms of the Deity, which pour out the Divine light on the individual in all his manifold being and grant him a radiant and fundamental unity with the Divine which act is realised at first as the incidence of Grace, as the incidence of power, incidence of beauty and incidence of knowledge, Gnosis. *Ārcā* thus is a pivotal concept of the Deity, and not just a mere idol, a representation, a symbol: all this it can become to those whose knowledge is warped by misunderstanding and who consider the known to be less true than the unknown.

I. The Sun has come up on the eastern mountain-top;
The night's darkness has completely gone;
As the beautiful morning has come, big flowers have blossomed and honey is dripping from them;
Gods and kings have come and are standing crowding on the opposite side;[1]
The elephants, male and female, that have come with them and the trumpets, are making loud noises in all directions like the noise of the ocean's-billows:
Therefore O Lord of Śrīraṅgam, wake up from Thine sleep!

II. The morning wind is blowing gathering the fragrance from the jasmine creepers;
The swan-couple lying on the lotus-bed shaking off the dew-drops from their wings have got up;
O Lord of Śrīraṅgam who removed the great peril of the suffering elephant caught between the huge mouth of the crocodile, wake up from Thine sleep!

III. The rays of the Sun have spread in all directions;
The stars in the sky have lost their lustre;
The bright cool Moon has become pale;
Darkness has passed away;
The gentle wind, blowing over the yellow gardens through the branches of beetle-nut trees is spreading their aroma;

1. The Lord who has descended into this world (Śrī raṅgam) is adored both by gods, celestials, rulers of heaven and rulers of the earth, Devas as well as Rākṣasas, who are good, and by ṛiṣhis, seers, who see no difference between the devotees of God, *adiyārs*.

O Lord of Śrīraṅgam who have in Thine beautiful hand the extremely powerful luminous discus!
Wake up from Thine Sleep!

IV. The sounds of the huge and tender buffaloes moving, the flutes of the cowherds who have untied them, the jingling noises of the bells (tied to their necks), these sounds have spread in all directions;
The honey-imbibing bees have all moved out (of their hives);
O Lord of Śrīraṅgam, Master of the celestials, Protector of the sacrifice (of Viśvāmitra) who destroyed the Laṅka's Rākṣasa hordes wielding the bow, and was anointed and crowned ruler and reigned at Ayodhyā for the purpose of destroying enemies (of light and truth)!
Wake up from Thine sleep!

V. The birds in the flower-garden have woken up;
The night has passed away; The morning has come;
The sounds of the waves of the sea are coming from the east.
The celestials have come with beautiful garlands made of many flowers humming with honey-bees, to offer them at Thine holy feet;
Therefore my Master! O Lord of the temple where the Ruler of Lanka (Vibhīṣaṇa) serves Thee!
Wake up from Thine sleep!

VI. Ādityas with their huge bejewelled chariots, eleven Rudras governors of the worlds, the peacock-riding six-faced god, Maruts, Vasus, and Aruṇa coming in procession, crowding with all their horses, chariots and songs and dances are arriving with Kumāra (at their head):
They are standing before Thine shrine to catch Thy sight. O Lord of Śrīraṅgam, wake up from Thine sleep!

VII. To the gates of Thy temple, O Master, Indra on his elephant has come;
And the hosts of the gods of creation and sages, rich with strenuous austerity, and Maruts, Siddhas, Vidyādharas, press on one another very close, and Yakṣas who are in love with Thine beautiful feet;

There is no space left (vacant) either on the sky or the earth; O Lord of Śrīraṅgam! wake up from Thine sleep!

VIII. The fragrant gods devotedly carrying to Thee great treasures in their hands (have come);
The Kapila (cow) and mirror and others, the first to catch Thine sight (have come):
The good sages Tumburu and Nārada (celestial singers of Thine praise) have come: The Sun spreading his great light has come and darkness has utterly been removed from the sky;
Therefore wake up, O Lord of Śrīraṅgam, from Thine sleep!

IX. Faultless mṛdaṅgam, single-stringed Viṇā, mardalam, Viṇā and flute are being played by Kinnaras, Garudas and Gandharvas, on all sides;
All through the night the great saints of austerity, the gods, caraṇas, (worshippers of Thine feet), messengers (of Thy will) yakṣas, siddhas, are anxiously waiting, crowding to touch Thy holy feet:
Therefore, so as to bestow Thy mercy-sight on them, O Lord of Śrīraṅgam, wake up from Thine sleep!

X. Fragrant lotuses have blossomed; the Sun has risen from the roaring waters of the eastern sea;
Slender-waisted ladies having bathed in the river, having rinced and shaken off the water from their tresses (and tied them up) wearing their clothes, have got up the banks: O Lord of Śrīraṅgam, girt by the Kāverī river, who have accepted me, the Rejoicer in the dust of feet of Thine devotees (TONDAR-ADIP-PODI) carrying in his hands the *tulasī*-garland, as fit object of Thine love (mercy), kindly wake up to bless Thine devotees!

ṚGVEDA AND VEṄKAṬACALA

BY

T. K. GOPALASWAMI AIYANGAR, M. A.

[The Hindu mind is so steeped in reverence to the Veda that it seeks to find basis for every religious conception in it; and if no apparent *Śruti* is forthcoming the mind cannot rest satisfied until it postulates one. The reverence to the Veda is so great that even the right of a God is sometimes required to be established on the basis of the Veda. Mr. T. K. Gopalaswami Iyengar in the present article tries to establish Vedic sanction for the God on the Seven Hills at this place. Whether sanctioned by Veda or not the God commands and deserves devotion from all Hindus. —Ed.]

Srī Veṅkaṭācala has been universally accepted as the most ancient of the hills in South India where Lord Śrīnivāsa is hailed as the presiding deity in this Kaliyuga. The holy hill comprises of a cluster of seven minor hills known by different names[1]. This is of all-India importance where millions of devotees from the Himālayas to the extreme South, march on pilgrimage with their pious vows and offer their obeisance to Him. The general convention among the Hindus is that Lord Śrīnivāsa removes all afflictions and accomplishes the four fold human desires. It is also unanimously accepted that there shall not be any further birth when once one adores Him by climbing up the holy hill. The greatness and the sanctity of the hill are borne testimony to by all literatures, Sanskrit, Tamil and Telugu and these co-ordinately express that without His divine grace[2], there shall be no other means for ultimate liberation in Kaliyuga. The prominence of Lord Śrīnivāsa in this yuga is brought out by the oft-quoted Purāṇic excerpt "*Kalau Veṅkaṭanāyakaḥ*"[3] Invariable references to Śrī Veṅkaṭācala are made in many Purāṇas and they sing in a chorus the sactifying aspect of the hill on the one hand and of the presiding deity on the other.[4] The famous *Tiruvāyimozhi* of Śrī Śaṭhakopamuni consists of the spontaneous outpourings of the great

1. Śeṣaśaila, Garuḍācala, Veṅkaṭādri, Nārāyaṇādri, Vṛṣabhādri, Vṛṣādri and Añjanādri.

2, विना वेङ्कटेशं न नाथो न नाथः सदावेङ्कटेशं स्मरामि स्मरामि ।
हरे वेङ्कटेश, प्रसीद प्रसीद प्रियं वेङ्कटेश, प्रयच्छ, प्रयच्छ ॥

3. कृते वरदराजस्तु त्रेतायां रङ्गनायकः ।
द्वापरे च जगन्नाथः कलौ वेङ्कटनायकः ॥

4. वेङ्कटाद्रिसमं स्थानं ब्रह्माण्डे नास्ति किञ्चन ।
वेङ्कटेशसमो देवो न भूतो न भविष्यति ॥

seer with respeet to the cxtreme compassion of Lord Śrīnivāsa towards his devotees who surrender to Him. Almost all the other saints (*Āḻvārs*) and *Ācaryas* concur in that their very sustenance in the world would not have continued, had they not concentrated their entire senses on Him. Śrī Rāmānuja mentions in his *Śrī Bhāṣya* that Lord Śrinivāsa is *Brahman*[1] described in the Upaniṣads. Śrī Vedānta Deśika, the follower of Śrī Rāmānuja, maintains that self-surrender to the holy hill[2] alone conduces to the attainment of *mukti* and that the presiding deity is none other than Divine Love, incarnate.[3] It is also noteworthy that besides the Hindus, even Jains make impartial and respectful statements with regard to the greatness of Lord Śrinivāsa.[4]

In this short contribution, I propose to prove the Ṛgvedic origin of the holy hill and attempt to show the indifference of the commentators in the interpretation of a Ṛgvedic stanza in a particular context.

Before dealing with the thesis on hand, it is equally important to know what exactiy the term Veṅkaṭācala means. It is defined in two different Purāṇas thus.

(१) सर्वपापानि वें प्राहु: कटस्तद्दाह उच्यते ।
सर्वपापापहारित्वात् वेङ्कटाद्रिरितीरित: ॥

Varāhapurāṇa

(२) वकारोऽमृतबीजन्तु कटमैश्वर्यमुच्यते ।
अमृतैश्वर्यसङ्घत्वात् वेङ्कटाद्रिरितिस्मृत: ॥

Vāmanapurāṇa

1. श्रुतिशिरसि विदीप्ते ब्रह्मणि श्रीनिवासे
भवतु मम परस्मिन् शेमुषी भक्तिरूपा ॥ (*Srī Bhāsya* 1-1-1).
2. प्रपद्ये तं गिरिं प्राय: — *Daya Śataka* 1st verse.
3. कमप्यनवधिं वन्दे करुणावरुणालयं ।
वृषशैलतटस्थानां स्वयंव्यक्तिमुपागतम् ॥ *Daya Śataka*
4. *Śilappadikārā*. Bk. XI lines 41-51. A translation of the above Tamil lines rendered by Dr. S. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar in his *History of Tirupati* may be cited here for the readers, information.

" High on Veṅgaḍam's towering crest with flowring streams in flood,
Betwixt the effulgent glory, of shining Sun and Moon,
Like unto a blue cloud in lightning dresst,
In all the brilliance of rainbow dight,
The red-eyed great One, majestic stands,
In dress of flowery brilliance with garland bright,
One lotus hand with fearsome disc adorned and milkwhite conch (the other held)."
(Vol. I Page 97)

It is generally supposed by the commentators, on the strength of the authority above-quoted, that the portion 'Vem' of 'Venkaṭa' is an indeclinable in Sanskrit meaning, sins.[1] It is curious to find that no Sanskrit lexicographer enumerates this component part 'Vem' in the list of indeclinables nor is it found enumerated either by Pāṇini or Patañjali in their works. This evidently evinces the fact that this portion, be it an indeclinable or some other grammatical entity, must be pre-Pāṇinian in origin which would have entered into the limbo of forgotton and insignificant things at the time when Pāṇini worked up his system of grammar. Even Yāska who is supposed to have flourished prior to Pāṇini and in the intermediate stage between Vedic and classical periods, does not take notice of either the word 'Veṅkaṭa' as a whole or 'Vem' as a constituent part, connected with any other word or words in his *Nirukta*, the oldest Indian treatise on etymology, philology and semantics of the Vedic language. Thus this process of elimination in the Sanskrit literature, right up to Yāska, evidences beyond doubt that the term "Veṅkaṭa" or the component part "Vem", meaning sins, must have originated in the Vedic period, either in the Saṁhitā or Brāhmaṇa period. Monier Williams,[2] the famous oriental scholar, maintains that "Vyaṅkaṭa" (व्यङ्कट) was the original Sanskrit form which later on was Prākṛtised into Veṅkaṭa. This piece of information is indeed new and it is bound to throw a flood of light on the investigation and reconstruction of the original Sanskrit form prior to Vyaṅkaṭa on the one hand and the Prakṛt form Veṅkaṭa on the other. Even assuming Vyaṅkaṭa as the original Sanskrit form, it is impossible to derive the word in unison with the etymological meaning expressed in the Purāṇas. Further, nowhere in any literature, do we find the word Vyaṅkaṭa as a substitute for Veṅkaṭa. Even Monier Williams does not quote the source of information to assume such a modification of the word from Sanskrit into Prākṛt.

The second definition as depicted in the *Vāmanapurāṇa* namely, letter "Va" of "Vem" stands for *amṛta* or non-birth and 'kaṭa' represents *aiśvarya* or prosperity, must have originated considerably at a later period since such an assumption of the meaning is pivoted on the authority of the Mantra Śāstra. Further it should also be

1. वेमिति पापार्थकमव्ययम्—सन्देशद्वयसारास्वादिनी (Page 1 Vide J. S. V. O. I Vol. VII, No 1.)

2. *Religious thought and life in India*, Page 267, *Sanskrit English Dictionary* Page 1014.

remembered that the component part is "Vem" and not "Va" and so the Mantra Śāstra cannot be relied upon for explaining the position of "Va" as 'Vem' in the word 'Veṅkaṭa'. So this part of the definition has to be discarded inasmuch as it has no reference to the etymological and phonetic development of the term to the present form Veṅkaṭa.

In this connection Śrī Vedānta Deśika's account of the holy hill renders a good deal of help to arrive at some conclusion. A running translation of the Tamil stanza[1] may be cited thus.

"This is the hill which unveils to us (the worst sinners) the two holy feet of Lord Kṛṣṇa;

This is the hill which roots out the twofold sins (*puṇya* and *Pāpa*) inherent in the soul that enchain one to the cycle of births and deaths;

This is the veritable *eternal bliss* which is self-glorious;

This is the hill where clear and crystal-watered holy falls (good and pious ācāryas) accumulate;

This is, in sooth, the hill which brings about the divine experiences of the world of the liberated;

This is the common asylum where both mortals and immortals meet and participate;

And this is that famous and effulgent hill known by the honorific epithet Veṅkaṭācala."

Thus Śrī Vedānta Deśika considers the holy hill more than the presiding deity even. The stanza is highly noteworthy for the fact that the derivative sense conveyed by the term 'Veṅkata' is clearly expressed in the second line which brings into our memory, the Upaniṣadic passage "पुण्यपापे विधूय निरञ्जनः परमं साम्यमुपैति" (Discarding *puṇya* and *pāpa*, Vidvān becomes alike to Brahman). The mention of the two fold sins expressed by "Iru vinaiyum" in the

1. *Rahasyatrayasāra.*
Kaṇaṇaṇḍi yiṇai yemakku kāṭṭum verpu
Kaḍuvinaiyari*ruvinaiyum kaṭiyum verpu*
Tiṇṇam idu vēṭennattikazum verpu
Teḷinda perum tīrthamkal śerinda verpu
Punniyattin pukalidennappukazum verpu
Ponnulakil pokamellām puṇarkum verpu
Viṇṇavarum maṇṇavarum virumpum verpu
Veṅkaṭa verpena viḷangum veda verpē."

second line is the purport conveyed by the portion "सर्वपापानि वें प्राहुः" defined in *Varāhapurāṇa.* The significance of "सर्वपाप" is to be understood to refer to such of the things that enchain a person to the cycle of births and deaths. Even the *Puṇya* or meritorious deed acquired by one's performance of the Vedic austerities is indeed an obstacle to one's attainment of everlasting cessation from births, as the fruits thereof are non-eternal and conduce ultimately to getting the soul cabined, cribbed and confined again to the mundane world.[1] Thus *Puṇya* is to be considered by the *mumukṣu* or aspirant for liberation as a bar to one's attainment of *mukti* and should be treated like *pāpa* deserving to be dismissed.[2] The import conveyed by the second definition *Vāmanapurāṇa* can also be taken to have been indicated by stated in the sixth line where the holy hill is supposed to procure "Divine experiences" exclusive to the world of the librated, inasmuch as the meaning 'Amṛta' as signified by the lettes "Va" of "Vem" can be possibly extended to the eternal bliss in accordance with the Vedic authority "साहि श्रीरमृतासताम्"

For our purpose on hand, the ultimate line of the stanza is an eye-opener to dive deep to investigate into the heart of the question underlying the exposition of the term "Veṅkaṭa". The last line expressly states "This is the famous and effulgent" Veda verpu or Veda Parvata (Vedic hill) known by the honorfiic appellation Veṅkaṭācala". The compound word Vedaverpu or Vedaparvata admits of two grammatical dissolutions, *Vedamayaḥ parvataḥ* (the hill an embodiment of the Vedas) and *Veda-pratipādya-parvata* (the hill which is glorified! in the Vedas). These two variations in the dissolution of the compound are however, accorded sanction by the *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa* thus

(१) एवं श्रीकृष्णरूपेण क्रीडितो वेङ्कटाचले ।
अरायिकाणें विकटे गिरिं गच्छति तं विदुः ॥

(२) एवं वेदमयस्साक्षात् गिरीशः पन्नगाचलः ।

[*Veṅkaṭācalamāhātmya, 5th Adhyāya verse 20 & 21 Page 344 Telugu Edition.*]

Though the second example is easily understood as supporting the interpretation, the first stanza is sure to baffle any commentator

1. क्षीणे पुण्ये मर्त्यलोकं विशन्ति ।
2. धर्मं त्रैवर्गिकं च स्वयमिहनिगमः पाप्मकोटौ पपाठ *Tattvamuktākalapa*

with regard to the import that it exactly conveys. The passage 'अरायिकाणे विकटे गिरिं गच्छ' shall be the quotation from some text by virtue of the presence of 'इति' in the end This excerpt is indeed the Ṛgvedic stanza found in 10th Maṇḍala 155-1 which runs thus—

"अरायिकाणे विकटे गिरिं गच्छ सदान्वे ।
शिरिंबिठस्य सत्त्वभिः तेभिष्ट्वा चातयामसि" ॥

Thus it is quite obvious that the excerpt has been referred to by the seers of the Purāṇic period so as to invite the attention of the devotees to the time-honoured tradition about the importance of the hill in general and annihilation of all sins repugnant to the attainment of *Mukti* in particular. Therefore the chain of our investigation has to be centred upon the Vedic stanza referred to in the *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa* whether it imports the meaning in harmony with the context or not. It is to be noted that Yāska, the Vedic etymologist and Sāyana, the Vedic commentator, interpret[1] the Vedic stanza in question, in one and the same manner. Yāska while deriving the etymology of the terms '*sadānve*' and '*Śirimbiṭha*', instances the above mentioned Vedic stanza and interprets it in a different manner with no reference to any anecdote in unison with the Purāṇic import. If the Vedic stanza in question is rendered in accordance with Yāska's interpretation of the Vedic terms, it does not convey any sense thereby helping us to

1. अदायिनि काणे विकटे । काणः विक्रान्तदर्शनः इत्यौपमन्यवः । कणतेर्वा स्यात् अणूभावकर्मणः । कणतिः शब्दाणूभावे भाष्यते अनुकणित इति । मात्राणूभावात् कणः । दर्शनाणूभावात् काण । विकटः विक्रान्तगतिः इत्यौपमन्यवः । कुटतेर्वास्यात् । विकुटितो भवति । गिरिं गच्छ । सदानोनुवे शब्दकारिके । शिरिंबिठस्य सत्त्वभिः । शिरिंबिठः मेघः । शीर्यते बिठे । बिठ बीरिठेन व्याख्यातम् (Nirukta 5-18). तस्य सत्त्वैः उदकैः इति स्यात् । तैः त्वा चातयाम । अपि वा शिरिंबिठः भारद्वाजः कालकर्णोपेतः अलक्ष्मीं निर्नाशयांचकार । तस्य सत्त्वैः कर्मभिः इति स्यात् । तैः त्वा चातयामः । चातयतिः नाशने ।

Nirukta VI-30.

It is important to note the following points in the above extract.

(1) Yāska is not definite in his etymology.
(2) Śirimbiṭha means either the cloud or Bhāradvāja.
(3) —biṭha of Śirimbiṭha is explained as atmosphere on the ground of phonetic similarity with "bīriṭha" (Nirkuta 5-27).

Śāyana comments thus.

हे अरायि—अदायिनि दानविरोधिनि, हे काणे, कुत्सितशब्दकारिणि, कुत्सितदर्शने वा, हे विकटे विकृतगमने, विकृताङ्गे वा, सदान्वे सदानेनुवे, सर्वदाक्रोशकारिणि, दुर्भिक्षाधिदेवते गिरिं पर्वतं निर्जन-प्रदेशं गच्छ । अस्मान् मा बाधिष्ठाः । शिरिंबिठस्य । बिठमन्तरिक्षं । शीयते बिठेऽन्तरिक्षे इति शिरिम्बिठो मेघः । तस्य सत्त्वभिः अन्तर्वर्तमानैरुदकैः - तेभिः -- तैस्त्वा त्वां चातयामसि—चातयामः— नाशयामः । यद्वा शिरिंबिठस्यैतत्संज्ञस्य भरद्वाजपुत्रस्य तेभिः तैरनुष्ठितैः सत्त्वभिः कर्मभिः हे अलक्ष्मि, त्वां विनाशयामः । इतस्त्वमेव शीघ्रं गिरिं गच्छ ॥ Ṛg Veda. 10. 155-1

know the exact meaning of the verse above-quoted in *Bhaviṣyottara-purāṇa*. The translation of the Ṛg vedic stanza may be cited thus.

> "Go to the hill, O barren, one-eyed, hideous, ever screaming famine. We frighten thee away with those heroes of the cloud".[1]

This in the light of Yāska's interpretation, is an address to the goddess of famine (Alakṣmī) to get away from the densely populated centres to the dreary hilly tracks and a caution to the same goddess that in case she will not move away, she will be forced to quit the spot consequent upon their invocation to Śirimbiṭha or the cloud.

Śāyana too, in the course of his commentary on the entire Ṛg-veda, renders the Vedic stanza, in question in the same manner as his precursor, Yāska, and does not add anything new with respect to the rendering of the terms "Vikaṭa" "Sadānve" and 'Śirimbiṭha'.

Thus, failing to elicit the exact sense conveyed by the except' "अरायिकाणे विकटे गिरिं गच्छेति तं विदुः" either with the help of the etymology of Yāska or the commentary of Śāyana, it remins for us to ren. er the passage in accordance with the spirit of the Purāṇic literature. In this, it is clearly brought out in the entire stanza that Lord Kṛṣṇa sported in the Vedic hill, Veṅkaṭācala and that people knew it (the hill) as अरायिकाणे etc. Thus it can be asserted in unequivocal terms that Veṅkaṭācala assumed once a Vedic appellation "Vikaṭa-giri" at some primitive stage and that it should be honoured with great respect for its sanctity and antiquity. The concatenation of the terms "Vikaṭa" and "Giri", therefore, signifies in entirety Vikaṭagiri (Veṅkaṭagiri or Veṅkaṭācala), which perhaps may be a name current in the Purāṇic period and accords freer scope to interpret the stanza thus

"Thou, needy, one eyed, go to Vikaṭagiri (Veṅkaṭagiri)"

Such a concatenation of 'Vikata' and 'Giri' to signify Venkaṭācala which presupposes "Vikaṭa" as a form of Veṅkaṭa at some primitine stage, is indeed, a clear deviation from the stupendous tradition preserved by Yāska in the pre-Christian era and by Śāyana in the post-Christian era. The term 'Vikaṭa' is treated both by Śāyaṇa and Yāska, as the Nominative of address, attributed to the Goddess of famine and 'Giri' interpreted as an unpopulated region (*Nirjanapradeśa*). Yāska dervies the word from the root *kuṭa* to move and attributes the sense 'hideous' to it in combination with the

1. *Nirukta*. Translation by Lakshman Sarup. Page 109.

preposition 'Vi.' Thus it is really a quandary confronting a critic whether to accept the authority of the Purāṇas or subordinate it to the weighty tradition upheld by Yāska and Śāyana in their works.

A careful survey and a dispassionate recapitulation of the Ṛg-vedic text, with reference to the context, shall disclose the truth that the terms 'Vikaṭegiri' deserve to be concatenated to import a hilly locality named "Vikaṭa or Vikate". The Ṛgvedic stanzas 10—155-1 to 6 comprising of one hymn and beginning with अरायिकाणे are considered by the Vedic commentators as referring to three different deities, among whom, the deity responsible for averting misfortune (*Alakṣmighṇa*) is considered as the deity for the stanza, in question. With respect to the other mantras or stanzas, Brahmaṇaspati and Śirimbitha are considered to be the deities to be invoked. The stanza 10—155-1 is supposed to scare away the Goddess of famine to the hilly unpopulated tracks and the next one is a kind of request to Brahmaṇaspati to put down the atrocious actions of the Goddess of famine and restrain her from doing injury to the young ones in the embryo stage and causing the medicinal herbs inefficacious by her supreme dominence. The very next stanza (Ṛgveda. 10-15-3), is the turning point to arrive at the thesis on hand. The full mantra may be cited thus.

"अदो यद्दारु प्लवते सिन्धोः पारे अपूरुषम् ।
तदारभस्व दुर्हणः तेन गच्छ परस्तरम् ॥"

(*Ṛgveda 10. 155. 3*)

This Mantra is interprted by Sāyana in two different manners,[1] one as an address to the laudator and the other to the Goddess of famine.

1. Sāyana comments on this mantra thus

"अदो विप्रकृष्टदेशे वर्तमानं अपूरुषं निर्मात्रापुरुषेण रहितं, यद्दारु दारुमयं **पुरुषोत्तमाख्यं देवताशरीरं** सिन्धोः पारे समुद्रतीरे प्लवते जलस्योपरिवर्तते तद्दारु, हे दुर्हणो दुःखेन हननीय, केनापि हन्तुमशक्य, हे स्तोतः आरभस्व, आलभस्व । **उपास्स्वेत्यर्थः** । तेन दारुमयेन देवेन उपास्यमानेन **परस्तरं अतिशयेन तरणीयं उत्कृष्टं वैष्णव लोकं गच्छ** ।

अपर आह—हे दुर्हणो, दुःखेन हननीय, दुष्टहनुयुक्ते वा हे अलक्ष्मि, सिन्धोः पारे समुद्रतीरप्रान्तेऽ पूरुषं पुरुषैः जनैः वियुक्तं, अदः अस्मत्तः दूरेदेशे वर्तमानं यद्दारु दारुमयी नौः प्लवते, तद्दार्वारभस्व परिगृहाण । गृहीत्वा च तेन दारुणा परस्तरं अतिशयेन तरणीयं ब्रह्मणस्पतिना प्रेरिता सती द्वीपान्तरं गच्छ ।

(It is important to note that Sāyana gives double interpretation to this Mantra. The first interpretation is undoubtedly out of the context. This evidently shows that Sāyana deviates form the context whenever he is convinced of attributing some other sense to the Mantra. This again shows that the tradition current in hi days might have prompted him to interpret the Mantra in a different manner. Anyhow he is not definite in his commentary).

In the course of his commentary with respect to the first interpretation, he takes the word "*dāru*" as *Puruṣottamākhyam devatā śarīram*, and interpiets "*durhaṇaḥ*" in the Vocative case attributing the meaning that which is indestructible and takes advantage of the Imperative '*ārabhasva*' as a mandate to the laudator to equip himself for spiritual concentration (*upāsana*). This express interpretation is a clear deviation on the part of Sāyana from the context. This is therefore an obvious instance to show that Sāyana subordinated the context in favour of some other tradition prevalent in his days and applied the same to suit some textual ancient record available to him. The mantra is, in sooth, a reference to Jagannāthakṣetra where Lord Kṛṣṇa is said to have abandoned his divine body in the sea which later on was found at Pūri Jagannath in a wooden form with human signs on it. Sāyana makes it quite clear that the spiritual concentration with regard to "dāru" (wooden form) as Puruṣottama, will conduce to the annihilation of all pains and help one to reach the other divine world known as *Vaikuṇṭha loka*. Thus it is highly significant to note that Sāyaṇa marks the stanza as one locating a spot highly conspicuous for its religiosity and spiritual concentration, and reminds the devotee of the Vedic mandate, conveyed by the Imperative mood. However, Sāyaṇa is not oblivious of the interpretation of the mantra with reference to the Goddess of famine. He commences his new interpretation with the words "*Aparaḥ āha.*" In accordance with the second interpretation the mantra is construed to convey the sense of an advice to the Goddess of famine to catch hold of a woodden plank, floating in the far-off ocean or sea and reach the other shore, never to return.

These two interpretations, therefore, go together to prove the fact that Sāyana diverges from the Vedic interpreters whenever he is convinced to deviate on reasons of tradition either Purāṇic or some other reliable source. So, it may be conceded that Sāyana's taciturnity with regard to the commentary of any Ṛgvedic mantra consistant with some Purāṇic or some other reliable reference or tradition in the Sanskrit literature, shows that he lacked information at the time when he wrote the commentary. Had he known the Ṛgvedic excerpt mentioned in *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa* refering to Ṛgveda 10—155-1, he would have as well interpreted the stanza in the manner of his comments on Ṛgveda 10—155-3, with double interpretation. Even Yāska's interpretation of Ṛgveda 10—153-1 as a hymn utilised to scare away the Goddess of misfortune, has also to be understood that he lacked information as to the reference of the

mantra to a hilly spot in the Purāṇic literature. Thus in the light of the analogy evidenced by Ṛgveda 10—155-3, it can be safely concluded that 'Vikaṭegiri' shall also be an important hilly spot where the needy, the miserable, and the blind resort and pray to scare away the Goddess of famine or misfortune.

That the term Vikaṭa refers to a hilly holy spot is evidenced by an Upaniṣad known as *Pāramātmikopaniṣad* wherein the presiding deity Lord Śrinivāsa is referred to as *Vikaṭāya pitre* (the lord of Vikaṭa). The text runs thus—

"रयिः ककुद्मान् दधद्विनष्टं रयिमद्विधानं तस्मै ककुत्रे विकटाय पित्रे स्वाहा"

(*Pāramātmikopaniṣad 1-3*)

The famous commentator, Śrinivāsamakhin[1], refers to the Ṛgveda 10—155-1 and adds one more information that the term

1. The commentary runs thus

"रयिः ऐश्वर्यरूप. ककुद्मान् वृषभाचलवान् यद्वा श्रेष्ठः दधद्विनष्टं येनकेनप्रकारेण यस्मैकस्मैचित् विनष्टं वरप्रदानादिमुखेन प्रापयन् रयिमद्विधानं रयिः इत्यनेन ऋचस्समानि यजूंषि । साहिशीरमृतासताम् इति श्रुत्युक्तं विधानं विधिः श्रुतिप्रसिद्ध इत्यर्थः । अनेन शास्त्रयोनित्वं दर्शितम् । ककुत्रे ककुदिस्थिताय विकटाय वेङ्कटाय । ऋग्वेदे "अरायिकाणे विकटे............चातयामसि ॥" इति ॥ हे अरायि ऐश्वर्यहीने, काणे एकाक्षिन् अन्धस्य गमने सामर्थ्याभावात् काणस्य यथाकथंचित् गमनयोग्यतासम्भवतीति काणेत्युक्तम् । विकटे गिरिं गच्छ वेङ्कटगिरिं प्रति गच्छ ।

"चतुर्हूतो ह वै नामैषः । तं वा एतं चतुर्हूतꣳसन्तं । चतुर्हेतेत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण । परोक्षप्रिया इव हि देवाः"

"इन्द्रो ह वै नामैषः । तं वा एतमिन्द्रꣳसन्तं । इन्द इत्याचक्षते परोक्षेण । परोक्षप्रिया इव हिदेवाः" ॥ इति श्रुतेः परोक्षेणोक्तम् सदान्वे सर्वदा अन्वेषणं कुरु । यद्वा सर्वदान्वेषय । शिरिंबिठस्य श्रीपीठस्य,

स्वामिपुष्करणीतीरे कोटिकन्दर्पमूर्तिमान् ।
आस्ते लक्ष्म्या च धरया रमन् षोडशवार्षिकः ॥ इति

सत्त्वभिः सात्विकगुणैः तेभिः तैः त्वा त्वां चातयामसि चातयामः विनाशयामः ।

(Vide Unpublished Upaniṣads edited by Adyar Library Page 171)

(This extract has to be considered for furnishing the following new information.)

(1) The word Sirimbiṭha is commented upon as Srīnivāsa. It appears quite probable that the word Śrī assumes the form Siri due to Anaptyxis or *ajbhakti* in the Sanskrit language. The portion biṭha may also be taken to be some modified form of Pīṭha at one stage in the development of the language signifying *pīṭha*. The concatenation of the original forms "Srī" and "pīṭha." somehow brings out the sense Śrīpīṭha or the seat for Srī which amounts to Srīnivāsa. It is doubtful whether the term Srī was associated with the meaning Lakṣmī in the Ṛgvedic period or not. But Srī in the sense 'prosperity' is not uncommon in the Vedic language श्रियैयशसे बलायाभिषिञ्चामि. Yāska's interpretation of biṭha in the sense of atmosphere or *antarikṣam*, basing his arguments on the

Śirimbitha conveys the sense 'Śrīnivāsa' and not cloud or Bharadvāja as Yāska and Sāyana maintain. It is doubtful whether Lord Śrīnivāsa is meant by the term Śirimbitha in the Ṛgvedic period. But for our purpose on hand, it can be stated that "Vikaṭe" is quoted as a term representing Veṅkaṭagiri or Venkaṭācala.

Thus *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa* and *Pāramātmikopaniṣad* go together to confirm that the term, 'Vikaṭe' found in the Ṛgvedic mantra 10–155–1 shall stand for Veṅkaṭa of the Purāṇic period. Taking into account the terms *Vikaṭa, Vyaṅkaṭa* and *Venkaṭa*, it can be stated that none of these terms assists us in deriving them with the aid of Pāṇini's *Aṣṭādhyāvī* or Yāska's *Niruktā*, in conformity with the Purāṇic meaning attributed to the component parts, *Vi–*, *Vyam–*, or *Vem* in the sense of "All sins" (*Sarvapāpāni*). So, some primitive form has to be reconstructed for the first part which shall convey the import "sins" on the one hand and be liable to modification to the present from 'Vem' due to some elision of a letter or two in the course of phonetic development. I maintain that the term "Veṅkaṭa" originally assumed the form "*Vyamhaḥkaṭa*" (Vi-aṃhaḥ-kaṭa) which later on changed into *Vyaṃkaṭa* [Vyam(haḥ)kaṭa] and then into Veṅkaṭa just as Vyadh in Sanskrit is changed into Vedh in Pāli. Although the phonetic development crept in and reduced the primitive form to the present form 'Venkaṭa', the traditionalists had been keen in the preservation of the meaning originally conveyed by the term. Even to-day the term 'Constituent Assembly' is reduced to the form 'Consambly' and nobody doubts that the first portion, cons, represents the term constituent and–ambly, the assembly. In a similar manner the position of Veṅkaṭa as Vikaṭa in the Ṛg. Veda, *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa*

condition of phonetic similarity with beriṭa is far form being satisfactory. Instances of Anaptyxis in the Vedic language are many like सुवं हि अग्ने, पृथ्वी, पृथिवी etc. and such an occurence is supposed to have been introduced to satisfy the conditions of metre. In my opinion, the term Śirimbitha may be reconstructed to the form Śrīpīṭha in the sense "the substratum for prosperity" unless arguments are advanced to identify Lakṣmī with Śrī in the Ṛgvedic period.

(2) A curious interpretation of the position of Veṅkaṭa as Vikaṭa is stated in this extract. It is said that the Vedic style and mania are always towards twisting the facts so as to baffle others. Gods are said to derive great pleasure when their names are twisted and applied to them. Two Vedic instances are here cited in this extract. The person whose real name is चतुर्हृत: is addressed as चतुर्होत:. Similarly Indra is the original name and the twisted name is *Inda* which is supposed to cause much delight for God Indra. Extending the same analogy, the commentator justifies the name Vikaṭa as the nom-de-plume for Veṅkaṭa in the Vedic period.

and *Pāramātmikopaniṣad* can be explained by the assumption of two hypotheses in the development of the language. It can be justified by assuming *two recensions*, one preserving *aṁhaḥ* and the other discarding it. Assumption of *aṁhaḥ* which gave rise to '*Vyaṁhaḥkaṭa*' ultimately ended in the formation of Veṅkaṭa after undergoing the modification, Vyaṅkaṭa, in the intermediate stage. Discording of *aṁhaḥ* resulted in the formation Vikaṭa which is referred to by the Ṛgveda and *Pāramātmikopaniṣad.*

That such a concatenation of the terms 'Vi' and 'aṁhaḥ' is not unknown and uncommon in the Vedic literature, can be endorsed by two tangible instances viz एवा त्वमस्मत् प्रमुञ्चा व्यꣳहः प्रातार्यग्ने प्रतरान्न आयुः *Taiti Samhita* 4–7) and व्यस्मद्द्वेषो व्यतरत् व्यꣳहः। व्यमीवाꣳश्चातयस्वा विपूचीः (*Taiti Brah.* 2–7). Sāyana renders the term *Vyaṁhaḥ*' as "Vividham pāpam" (different sins) in his commentary on the Samhitā portion. So it may be concluded on the authority of 'Vyaṁhaḥ' found in the Vedic litarature that 'Veṁ' of Veṅkaṭa presupposes the full orginal form Vyaṁhaḥ which phonetically culminated in the present form in the course of the development of the language.

Another alternative may also be suggested which may appear justifiable and true. The original form may as well be reconstructed as '*Vyenaḥ kaṭa*' which, as years rolled on, might have undergone acoustic changes and modified into Vyeṅkaṭa [Vyen(aḥ)kaṭa] and ultimately into Veṅkaṭa. It appears in the fitness of things that there is every possibility of Vyenaḥkaṭa assuming ultimately the form Veṅkaṭa. Even such a concatentation of *Vi* and *enaḥ* is also corroborated by *Taittiriya Samhitā*, व्येनाꣳसि शिश्रथो विष्वगग्ने, (4–7). However Sāyana construes the preposition 'Vi' with शिश्रथः but in the light of his commentary on Vyaṁhaḥ in the next sentence, he could have as well interpreted "Vividhāni enāṁsi" (different sins). Even otherwise, it can be stated that either in Vyaṁhaḥkaṭa or Vyenaḥkaṭa as the case may be, it cannot be a grammatical defect to construe the preposition Vi- with the verb -kaṭa of the word.

With regard to the sense conveyed by the term –kaṭa, there appears to be some difficulty. The Sanskrit grammarians enumarate. Kaṭa in the sense of raining and surrounding (*Kaṭa varṣāvaraṇayoḥ*). This meaning is exactly opposite to that expressed in *Bhaviṣyoyottarapurāṇa* "Kaṭaḥ taddāha ucyate" in the sense of burning. The difficulty can be solved by assuming that the word

Kaṭa is onomatapoetic in nature meaning that sins completely burn away producing the cracking sound (*Kaṭakaṭa*) justas firewood introduced into the fire. The lexicon *Trikāṇḍaśeṣa* states that the term Kaṭaḥ means burning ground.

" पञ्चावस्थः कटस्स्थानः, श्मशानन्तु शतानकम् ।

(*Kṣatriyavarg–61a*)

On the authority of the lexicon, the term Venkaṭa may be rendered to, convey the sense that it is a place where all sins burn away leaving no relic behind them. (*Vyanasām or Vyaṁhasām Kaṭaḥ or vyenāmsi Kaṭayati*).

Thus in the light of the above-stated instances and arguments, I maintain that the term Venkaṭa of Venkaṭācala traces back for its origin in the following manner.

(Retention of Aṁhaḥ) 1 Vyaṁhaḥ kaṭa (Deletion of Aṁhaḥ)

Vyaṅkaṭa (Vide Monier Williams Dictionary).
|
Veṅkaṭa-(in Pāli)

Vikaṭa (Referred to in Ṛg-veda, *Bhavisyōttara Purāṇa* & *Pāramātmakopanisd.*)

2 Vyenaḥkaṭa
|
(Vyen(aḥ)kaṭa)
|
Vyeṅkaṭa
|
(V(y)eṅkaṭa)
|
Veṅkaṭa

Wherefore I may conclude that Śrī Venkaṭācala is referred to in the Ṛgvedic period[1] as Vikaṭa and that it has been an asylum for the blind, the lame and the unfortunate to avert the physical defects and for the aspirant of liberation to attain felicitous fruits in the end.[2]

1. The expression 'Veda Verpu' (Vedic hill) of Śrī Vedāntadeśika is thus corroborated by this thesis. I invite the attention of the readers to Vedants desikaś statement in *Dravidopaniṣattatparyaratnāvalī* where he expressly states that the presiding deity is known in the capacity of being the lord of Veṅkaṭa in hundreds of Vedas ("ऊचे नाथं शरण्यं श्रुतिशतविदितं वेङ्कटेशं शठारिः"). This obviously shows that the *Lord of Veṅkaṭa* is eulogised in many Vedic passages and not in the Purāṇas only.
2. अकिञ्चननिधिं सूतिमपवर्गत्रिवर्गयोः

(*Dayaśataka*).

EMBERUMĀNĀR NEÑJUVIḌU TOOTU

T. P. PALANIAPPA PILLAI, B.O.L.

I present below for the first time to the Tamil scholars in general and Śrī Vaiṣṇava scholars in particular a rare unpublished Tamil Prabandham bearing the above title. Although an incomplete manuscript, it has the grandeur and exquisite mellifluence which are perceivable in compositions of similar type. Only a single incomplete cadjan manuscript copy is available in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, and my endeavour to secure complete copies of this prabandham in other Mss Libraries of our province to present this in its entire form was fruitless. In comparison with the Sanskrit Dūta Kāyas, several Tamil Tootu Prabandhams like Vaṇḍu viḍu tootu (வண்டு விடு தூது), Nārai viḍu tootu (நாரை விடு தூது), Kiḷḷai viḍu tootu (கிள்ளை விடு தூது), Mega viḍu tootu (மேக விடு தூது) etc. show that lovers pining in separation, attempt to send animate and inanimate messengers to their beloved, seeking their meeting, and are amorous in nature since they are generally expressive of love incidents. They are all secular and aim at mundane pleasures. But compositions bearing the title *Neñju viḍu tootu*, apart from their general setting, characteristically differ from the above mentioned works in that they are distinctly religious in nature, since disciples seeking from their preceptors ultra-mundane happiness, send their minds and hearts as envoys to their religious teachers and pose philosophy as their theme. In this aspect they are assuredly loftier and more elevating to the serene reader.

Tamil scholars are aware of some such compositions among Tamil literature as *Neñju viḍu tootu* by Umāpati Śivācārya, Śivaprakāśa Swāmigal, Tatvarāya Swāmigal and Mahāvidwan Mīnākshisundaram Pillai of recent fame. These works are by faith sectarian, in that Umāpati Śivācārya's work and Pillai's posit Śaiva Siddhantam current in the Tamil country, Śivaprakāsar's savours of Vīra Śaiva philosophy, Tatvarāyaswami's professes Vedāntism and respectively represent Śivādvaitam, Vīra Śaivādvaitam and Kevalādvaitam. And the authors of these works pay homage to and extol the greatness of their spiritual masters viz. Maṛai Gñāna Sambandar, Śivagñāna Bālaya Deśikar, Svarūpānandar and Subramaṇya Deśikar. We find here that while the other prevailing faiths of the Tamil country—Śaivism, Viraśaivism and Vedantism possess Neñju viḍu

tootu prabandhams, the Viśiṣtādvaitism of the Śrī Vaiṣṇavas of the Tamil country conspicuously lacks a Tamil Prabandham of this variety, since no work of this class representing Śrī Vaiṣṇavism is found to exist up to now. The Tamil Prabandham that I now present, though incomplete, fills the lacuna for Śrī Vaiṣṇavism, in that it extols the greatness and splendour of the great Ācārya Śrī Rāmānuja and his *darsan* in the land of their birth and represents it. And I fervently hope that Śrī Vaiṣṇava scholars will appreciate my humble endeavour in bringing this work within their easy reach even from a single manuscript copy.

Since the manuscript is incomplete we have no means of knowing the name of the author and the date of its composition. From the tenor of his composition we can conclude that he was an ardent Śrī Vaiṣṇava devotee of the great Ācārya Śrī Rāmānuja to whose august presence, he sends his mind as a devout and dutiful envoy. In conformity with the common feature of all Tootu Prabandhams in Tamil, the author addresses his mind and entreats it to act as his messenger to his spiritual master whose greatness and splendour are elaborately described in the customary manner of enumerating them in the *daśāṅgam* form. In such description, the birth-place of Śrī Rāmānujācārya—Śrī Perumbūdūr, the territory Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam to which it belongs, the hill Tirunīrmalai within its bounds, the river Pālār which has its majestic course through the territory, his garland of the sacred Tulasī, and other paraphernalia such as elephat, horse, banner and drum forming appendages of his spiritual domain are felicitously portrayed by the author.

Then the author proceeds to give the hierarchy of the Ācārya Mahāpuruṣās in the Śrī Vaiṣṇava line wherein he mentions the greatness of Tirukkacci Nambi, Periya Nambi, Yāmunācārya alias Āḷavandār, Maṇakkāl Nambi, Uyyakkoṇḍār, Nāthamuni, Śrī Śaṭakopa, Senā Mudali, Śrī Lakṣmī and Śrī Viṣṇu in the great pontifical line, and extols Śrī Rāmānuja as following the spiritual order of those celebrities. The greatness of Śrī Rāmānuja as described by the author is manifold and magnificent. The grandeur of his *darsan* Śrī Viśiṣtādvaita and his supreme talents in philosophical controversies and the splendour of his spiritual teachings are grandly expressed further. The messenger—mind—is given a warning to ward off waywardness and hesitancy and asked to proceed guardedly to the august presence of his spiritual master. Here break's the theme of this poem. This poem commences with five invocatory verses in Venbā

metre and has 226 lines of Kalivenbā metre and ends abruptly. The reading of the text in certain lines is uncertain and seems misleading and readers are therefore requested to exercise their judgment in determining the probable form since in its first presentation, I cannot alter or add anything unauthoritatively. I consider the preservation of manuscripts is more precious than the preservation of monuments.

எம்பெருமானார் நெஞ்சுவிடு தூது.

வெண்பா.

சீதார்ந்த வண்கருணைச் சீபெரும்பூ தூர்முனிமேற்
றூதார்ந்து நெஞ்சுவிடு தூதினுக்கு—வாதார்ந்த
வஞ்சமல மில்லா மகிழ்மாற னாருடைய
கஞ்சமலர்த் தாளிணையே காப்பு. 1

வாதியரை வென்றுதினம் வாழ்பெரும்பூ தூர்முனிமேற்
சோதிவிடு நெஞ்சுவிடு தூதினுக்கு—நீதியுடன்
வாழ்வா னதுபெருகும் வண்குருகூர் மாறன்முத
லாழ்வார்கள் தாளே யரண். 2

கற்றவர்தங் கண்ணாடி காதிவரும் வாதியரைச்
செற்றுவரும் வேதாந்தச் சிற்றாய—னற்றவர்சே
ரேதமொன்று மில்லா வெதிராசன் சேவடிக்கே
தூதுவிட்டே னெஞ்சைத் துணிந்து. 3

ஏரார் பெரும்பூதூ ரெம்பெருமா னார்முனிமேற்
சோராது நெஞ்சுவிடு தூதினுக்குச்—சீராருஞ்
செங்கமலை மார்பனடி சேருஞ் சடகோப
னங்கமலத் தாளே யரண். 4

தோடுழக்கும் வண்டுஞ் சுரும்புஞ் சுருளளகக்
காடுழக்கு மாதர் கலவிதனி—னீடுழக்கு
மிந்தவண்ண மாற வெதிராச னென்றென்றே
வந்தவண்ணம் பாடு மகிழ்ந்து. 5

சீரார் செழுங்கமலச் சேயிழையார் சேர்ந்திலங்குங்
காரார் திருமேனிக் கண்ணபிரான்—ஏராரு
முந்திக் கமலத்து நான்முகனை யுண்டாக்குஞ்
சிந்திக்குங் கார(ண)மே சித்தமே—வந்தித்தெ
னெஞ்சமே நீயென்னை நேராகக் கைவிட்டாற்
றஞ்சமே யாகுந் தகைமையா—ரஞ்சலெனத்

தந்தளித்த நல்ல வளவன் றெழாவின்றிக்
கந்தளித்த காலங் கழிந்தற்றூற்—கொந்தளித்த
காமத்தார் போனார் குரோதத்தார் கைவிட்டார்
நாமத்தா லும்பிறரை நான்மறந்தேன்—சேமத்தா

ருன்னையல்லா லில்லை னுனக்காகி யுன்னினைவே
யென்னை யல்லார் செய்தாரிங் காருளரோ—முன்னைமுதற்
பேதைப் பருவந் தொடங்கிப் பிறர்சிரிக்கத்
தாதைக்குந் தாய்க்குந் தவக்கற்றும்—பேதுற்ற
காரியங்கள் சொல்லிற் கலிகாலம் போதுமோ
சேரியெங்கு மென்றுஞ் சிலுகன்றோ—வீரியங்க
ளோரொன்றே யூழி(யா) நாதங்க ளூற்பவிக்கும்
வேறொன்றே வேறொன்று வேண்டுமோ—நீரொன்றே
யைம்புலனு மேதலுறு மவ்வோர் பொறிகளூட
னின்புறுதல் வேண்டி யெனைவிஞ்சி—வம்படரும்

வண்ணத் தனமடவார் வண்டார் சிலம்பொலிக்கும்
பண்ணுற்ற மென்மொழிக்கும் பாழானீ—ரெண்ணுற்ற
போதே தொடங்கிப் பொறிகலங்கிப் பூண்முலையின்
மீதே துயில விரும்பினீர்—தாதேர்
சுரும்பார் கருங்குழலுந் தூய்நகையுஞ் செவ்வா
யரும்பா ரழகுங்கண் டாற்றீர்—கரும்புங்
கனியு நறவுங் கடலமுதும் பாலு
முனியு மெயிற்றூறல் மூண்டீர்—துனிவிளைக்குஞ்
செய்யதளிர் மேனிதரு செவ்வி மணங்கொள்ள
வைய மறியமட லூர்ந்தீரே—எய்யுமத

னம்புக் கிலக்காகி யையவிடைப் பையநடைக்
கொம்புக் கிணங்கக் கொழுகொம்பா—யன்புற்று
வீற்றிருக்க நீரெண்ண வெவ்வினையேன் வீடின்றிக்
கூற்றிருக்கு மூரிற் குடியிருந்தேன்—ஊற்றிருக்கு
மள்ளற் குகையிலழுந் தாழங்காற் பட்டுழன்று
வெள்ளப் பிறவிதனில் வேசற்றே—னுள்ளமே
யாராயி விச்செல்வ மானந்தச் செல்வத்தி
லோரா யிரங்கூற்றி லொன்றுண்டோ—வாராயின்
றிந்த வளவி லுதவிக் கெதிருண்டோ
நொந்தவரைக் காப்பதுபோ னோன்புண்டோ—வந்தாங்க

மானக்கா லன்புடனே யவ்வவர்தந் தூதாகிப்
போனக்கா னெஞ்சே புகழன்றோ—ஊனக்கால்
கொண்டு மருணன் கொடுந்தேர் விடுமுதவி
கண்டுங் கருணை பிறவாதோ—பண்டு

மடுவார் களிறழைக்க வந்தவற்கிங் காதும்
வடுவான துண்டோ மனமே—நெடுவான்
மதிசூடி தேர்கடவி மங்காமற் காத்த
விதிசூடி நின்றவினை யுண்டோ—நிதிசூடும்
பாண்டவர்க்குத் தூதாகிப் பார்த்தற்குத் தேர்கடவு
மாண்டவற்கு மேலு மரசுண்டோ—பூண்டளக்கில்

நேராகி நெஞ்சே நினைவாகி னின்மலன்றன்
சீரார் தெசாங்கத் திருத்தங்கேள்—காராருந்
நீல நிறமலையு நீடார் வடமலையுஞ்
சோலை மலையுந் தொழுதுடையான்—வேலைசூழ்
மங்கைநகர் வாழ்வான மாமலையை நாடோறுங்
கொங்கலருஞ் சென்னிமேற் கொண்டுடையான்—றுங்கமலை
யண்டமெல்லாந் தன்மூ வடியா லளந்ததொரு
கொண்டல் கொடிமருங்குல் மின்னுடனே—வண்டரொடு
நின்றதிரு நீர்மலையை நேராகத் தானுடையா
னென்றமரு மிந்தக் கிரியிடத்தி—லொன்றுபடப்

பாரகில மூந்திப் பரிமளமே யாகிவளர்
காரகிலுஞ் சந்துங் கழைமுத்தும்—பேரியலுங்
கைந்நாகக் கொம்புங் கவரிகளுஞ் சாமரையும்
பைந்நாக மீன்ற பருமணியு—மொன்றுரை
வென்றடரும் வேட ரிறவுளார் வின்மறவர்
குன்றர் குறவர் குடிசைகளுஞ்—சென்றிடறிக்
கோலிக் குறிஞ்சி திறைகொண்டு கோங்குகமழ்
பாலைத் தழல்தணித்துப் பைந்தோகைப்—பீலித்
தழைகொண்டு முல்லைநிலந் தாண்டித்தண் டூன்றிக்
குழைகொண்டு கோனிரைகள் மேய்க்குங்—கழைகொண்ட

பண்ணையர் தங்கள் பதிகொண்டு பாற்குடங்க
ளெண்ணு யிரகோடி சென்றிடறி—வண்ணவேற்
கண்ணியர்தங் கையாற் கடைந்துறிமேல் வைத்த
வெண்ணெ யடைய மிசைமிதப்ப—விண்ணுலவுந்
தீங்கரும்புந் தெங்கைத் திறைகொள்ள வெண்ணிவளர்
தேங்கமழ்பூஞ் சோலைத் திரைத்தெழுந்து—பூங்கமுகின்
பாளை சிதறப் பலவின் கனியுதிர
மூளை சிதற முதுமேதி—வாளை
குதிகொண் டுகளக் குடதிசையி லுள்ள
நிதிகோண்டு மாமருத நீந்தி—யெதிர்கண்ட

கைதைமலர் சூடிக் கடல்வாணர் பேதையர்கள்
கொய்தகறு நீலங் கொண்டணிந்து—நெய்தலுறக்

கங்கையுடன் மேவிக் காவேரி சேவிக்கப்
பொங்குநீர் வேலை மணம்புணர—வெங்கெங்குந்
தேங்கி யெதிரலைந்து தெள்ளித் திரிந்துபுரிந்
தோங்கிவரும் பாலா றுடையவன்காண்—தேங்கமழுந்
தாது விரிபொழிலுந் தண்சுனைசேர் குன்றுகளும்
போதவிழும் வாவிகளும் பொய்கைகளு—மீதே
நெருக்குஞ் சுரும்பினமு நெஞ்சமே யெம்மை
யுருக்குந் திருநா டுரைக்கி—லருக்கன்

விளைவயலி னெற்பொலியை மேருவென வெண்ணி
வளையவரும் வண்புகழ்சேர் நாடன்—றளையவிழக்
குண்டரிகள் ளார்ந்துகளக் கண்ணுல் வயலெங்கும்
புண்டரிகம் பூக்கும் புனலுடன்—றெண்டிரைசூழ்
மல்லை திருவல்லிக் கேணி மழிசைநக
ரெல்லையில்சீ ரெவ்வு ளிடவெந்தை—சொல்லரிய
நின்றவூர் புட்குழிகை நீடார் திருக்கடிகை
நன்றிசேர் கச்சி நகர்சூழ்ந்த—வென்றிசேர்
கைத்திகிரி கொண்ட கருணை கரன்மருவு
மத்திகிரி வெஃகா வடியாக—முத்திதருஞ்

சீரார் திருப்பதிகள் சேருந் திருநாடன்
வாராருந் தொண்டை வளநாட—னேராருங்
கோகனகஞ் சூழ்வயலுஞ் கொண்டல்பொரு தண்டலையும்
பூகவனஞ் சூழும் பொழிலிடமு—மாகனகந்
தாங்கு மணிமதிலுந் தண்டரள மாளிகையு
மோங்குபெரும் பூதூ ருடையவன்காண்—தேங்குலவுந்
தாமரையும் வைகுந்தன் றாள்சேர்ந்த தண்டுளவத்
தாமமுந் தாராகத் தானுடையான்—...........
....
....—ண்டருடன்

வைகுந்தம் போமாறு வையமெல்லாம் வாழ்வோரு
மெய்குந்தம் போன்மாவை மேல்கொள்வான்—வைகுந்தன்
தாளாங்கந் தத்தணைத்துத் தன்மனமாம் வாரணத்தை
மாளா வறிவால் வணக்குவான்—கேளாரைக்
குன்றிக் கடியுங் கருடனுட னன்னஞ்சேர்
வென்றிக் கொடியுடைய வேதியன்காண்—நன்றிமிகு
நாத மிகமுழங்கி நால்வகையா கச்சிறந்த
வேதமெனும் வென்றி முரசுடையான்—பூதலத்தில்
பாதகருங் கேட்கிற் பரமபதந் தானளிக்குந்
தீதில் திருவாணை தானுடையான்—வேதநெறி

காட்டுந் திருக்கச்சி நம்பியிரு காற்கமலந்
தீட்டு மனமுடைய தேசிகன்கா—ணீட்டுலகோர்
தம்பெரிய வெம்பிறவி தப்பவிடுந் தாளுடையா
னம்பெரிய நம்பிசர ணாடுவான்—வம்பவிழ்தார்த்
தோளான் யமுனைத் துறைவன் முனிவர்தொழுந்
தாளா லெனையாளுந் தம்பிரான்—மாளாமன்
மீளவந் தாளும்பிறவி நோராது வேரறுக்கு
மாளவந்தா ருள்ளத் தருளுடையான்—கோளி
விணக்காம லேழ்பிறப்பு மாற்று மிராமன்
மணக்கால் வணங்கித் தொழுவான்—றணக்காரு

மெய்யைக்கொண் டாடி விழுநரகங் காத்தளிக்கு
முய்யக்கொண் டார்சரணே யுற்றவன்காண்—வையகத்து
வேத முனிவர்பதம் விண்ணளவென் றெண்ணிய
நாத முனிபதமே நாடினன்கா—ணோதரிய
மாறன் சடகோபன் வாக்கின் படியன்றி
வேறொன் றுரையாத வித்தகன்காண்—பேறென்று
சேனை முதல்வனடி சிந்திப்பான் செங்கமல
மானையொரு காலு மறவாதா—னானை
யழைக்க வருவா ரடிக ளடியேன்
பிழைக்க வருளும் பெருமாள்—தழைத்தபுகழ்ப்

பொய்கையார் பூதத்தார் பேயார் புதுவையர்கோன்
வைய்கையார் வேந்தன் மழிசையர்கோன்—செய்கையார்
தொண்டர்துகள் பாண்பெருமாள் துய்யவேன் மங்கையர்கோன்
கண்டநெறி காத்தருளுங் காவலன்காண்—பண்டையற
மூன்றுங்கால் குன்றுங்கால் முக்கோல் கலியுகத்தி
லூன்றுங்கா லாக்கு முதாரன்கா—ணீன்றதாய்
தந்தையினு நல்கிச் சரணா கதியளிக்கு
மெந்தை யிராமா னுசமுனிகா—ணெந்தரமொன்
றெண்ணாம லேழ்பிறப்பு மாற்றி யினியுடம்பி
னுண்ணாமற் காத்தருளு நாதன்காண்—பண்ணாரும்

பத்திநெறி நிற்கப் பரமபதந் தானளிக்கு
முத்திநெறி மூலையடி காட்டினன்கா—ணெத்திசையு
மாலையிட்ட வாதியரை வாக்கினால் வென்றுலகின்
மாலையிட்டு வாழு மதிப்பன்காண்—வேலைவட்ட
மொன்றாகுங் காலத்து மோங்கு மனுநீதி
குன்றாமற் காக்குங் குலபதிகாண்—சென்றாடு
காற்றாற் கலையாக் கனகா சலம்போலு
மாற்றார் கலையு மடங்கல்காண்—கூற்றுலகம்
வாசறொழு முள்ளிழுக்க வைகுந்த மேற்றுவிக்குந்
தாசரதி போலுந் தகவன்காண்—காசினியோர்

போற்றும் புனிதன் புவனம் பதினாலுஞ்
சாற்று மனமுடைய சான்றாளன்—மாற்றரிய
வென்பிறவி யாகு மருவிலங்கு வெட்டிவிடத்
தன்பிறவி யாகுந் தனிவள்ளல்—வன்பிறவி
மாகடலில் வாழாமன் வைகுந்த மாநகரிற்
போகவிட வல்ல புணையாள—னாகணையின்
மீதே விழித்துறங்கு மேக முலகளந்த
போதே புகலென்ற புண்ணியன்காண்—பூதேசன்
சாபந் தவிர்த்த பெருமாள் சரணங்கள்
தாபந் தணிக்குமெனச் சாற்றினன்காண்—மாபந்த
மெல்லாந் தவிர்த்தே யெழிலத்தி யூரர்கழல்
பல்லாண்டு போற்றும் பரமன்காண்—வில்லாண்ட
நன்னுதலார் கூட்ட நரகளிக்கு மென்றவரை
மன்னுதலா காவென்ற மாமுனிகாண்—பொன்னுலகி
னாளு மவரின்ப மஞ்சாறு நாழிகையின்
மாளு மெனமதியா வள்ளல்காண்—டாளிணையென்
னாய்த்தலைமேல் வைத்தருளு நாதன்கா ணான்மறையோ
ரேத்து மெதிராச ராசன்காண்—வாய்த்தபுகழ்
வேதமீ காமன்காண் வேதாந்த மோதும
பேதமே யென்ற பெருமான்காண்—போதமே
யுள்ளதுமற் றில்லை யுலகெல்லாம் பொய்யென்னுங்
கள்ளமத மோராக்கோ லாகலன்காண்—துள்ளிவருங்
காணாதர் பாசுபதர் கௌமாரி கர்கபிலர்
நாணா வணுகா நடுநடுங்கக்—கோணாத
செங்கோல் திருக்கையின் முக்கோ லெனச்செலுத்து
பொங்கோதம் போலப் புகழுடையான்—றங்கோலங்
கண்டவர்கண் மீளாக் கருமாலை காணாமல்
வண்டமர்பூந் தார்வழங்கும் வள்ளல்காண்—புண்டரிக
மாதார்ந்த மார்பன் வடமலையான் றாள்வணங்கி
வேதாந்த நூலுரைக்கும் வித்தகன்காண்—போதார்ந்த
வேதா வினுமிக்க வேதியன்பார் போம்வழியிற்
றாதார் கமலத் தடங்குடையுங்—காதாரு
மம்பஞ்சு கண்ணார்தம் மம்பொற் சிலம்படியிற்
செம்பஞ்சின் சேற்றிற் றியங்காதே—கம்பஞ்சேர்
வேதண்டக் கைபோலு மென்குறங்கு மேல்வீழ்ந்து
மாதண்டப் பட்டு மயங்காதே—மூதண்டம்
வென்றுதிறை கொள்ளும் வெங்க ணரவல்குற்
குன்றருகே சென்று குவியாதே—மன்றல்கம
ழுந்திச் சுழியு முரோமவொழுங் குன்னையடும்
வந்திக்கப் பட்டு மயங்காதே—சிந்திக்கிற்

பொய்யொன்று நேரிடையுன் போக்கொழிக்குஞ் சூழ்ச்சிதனை
மெய்யென்று நின்று விழியாதே—மையொன்றி
மாதாங்கக் கொம்படரும் வாரா ரிருகொங்கை
நீதங்கி வாழ நினையாதே—வேய்தங்குந்
தோண்மீது வீழ்ந்து துடிதுடித்துச் சோதிமலர்த்
தாண்மீது வீழ்ந்து தளராதே—வாண்மீது
நிற்பாரைப் போல நிலைதளர்ந்து காந்தண்மலர்ப்
பொற்பார் மணிக்கரத்துப் பூணாதே—கிற்பாரு
மார வடமணியு மங்கழுத்தி னீயழுந்திப்
பாரவிடாய்ப் பட்டுப் பதையாதே—சீருடைய

கொஞ்சு கிளியுங் குயிலுந் திறைகொள்ளுங்
கிஞ்சுகவாய்ச் சொல்லொன்றுங் கேளாதே—நெஞ்சமே
முல்லையட ராத முத்தைப் பொருந்துநகைக்கொன்
றில்லை யெதிரென் றிழையாதே—சொல்லுங்கால்
வாங்க வுயிரை வளர்தீ பகமனைய
பூங்குமிழ்மூச் சாடிடத்துப் போகாதே—நீங்கரிய
கண்ணம் புருவமெனக் கால்வளையும் வேல்விழிமே
லெண்ண மறியாம லேகாதே—வண்ணமணிக்
காதுடனே காதாதே கன்ன மிசையணியும்
போதுடனே நீபோது போக்காதே—பாதி

மதிபோல் வளைந்திலங்கும் வாளார் நுதலை
நிதிபோலு மென்றுநில் லாதே—யதிரேக
மாக வழகெறிக்கு மந்தா மரைமுகமூந்
தாகந் தணிக்குமெனத் தாழாதே—மேகந்
திறைகொள்ளுந் தாரளகஞ் சித்தமே யுன்னை
நிறைகொள்ளு மஞ்சிநில் லாதே—மறைகொள்ளும்
வேதியர்தம் மூர்தோறும் வெற்றிக் கொடிபுனைந்து
வாதியரை வெல்ல வருந்தாதே—...............
....
....

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE DOUBLE DATES ĀṆḌU AND EDIR-ĀṆḌU IN THE REGNAL YEARS OF CERTAIN CHŌḶA, PĀṆḌYA AND OTHER KINGS

BY

S. SUBRAHMANYA SASTRY, B.A ,

(Late Devasthanam Archæologist, Tirupati ; Author of the Tirupati Devasthanam Epigraphical Report, and Editor and Translator of the T. D. Inscriptions.)

(continued from Vol. VII Part 1)

The early Pāṇḍya king Māraññjaḍaiyan is represented by numerous inscriptions from the Tanjore, Trichinopoly, Madura and Tinnevelly districts and the Pudukkota and Travancore states, and also Toṇḍai-nāḍu[1], ranging in dates from the 2nd to the 37th year of his reign. Quite possibly he had reigned for nearly 40 years. No. 413 of 1904 at Trichinopoly dated in the 4th year of Māraññjaḍaiyan mentions the Pāṇḍyādhipati Varaguṇadēva, while No. 414 of 1904 from the same place dated in the 4th year of Māraññjaḍaiyan calls the king Pāṇḍyādhirāja Varaguṇadēva, so much so that Māraññjaḍaiyan has been identified with Pāṇḍyādhirāja Varaguṇa Mahārāja.[1] No. 705 of 1905 at Aivarmalai in the Madura district furnishes the Śaka year 792 as corresponding to the 8th year of Varaguṇa, which shows his accession to have taken place in Śaka 784 corresponding to A. D. 862-63. No. 690 of 1905 at Rāmanāthapura in the Madura district mentions an expedition of Māraññjaḍaiyan against Iḍavai in the Chōḷa country and a Trichinopoly inscription mentions his destruction of the fortifications of Vembaṟṟūr or Vēmbil in the same Chōḷa country. Thence he carried his arms into Toṇḍai-nāḍu as far north as Araiśūr on the Pennār river but he was obliged to retrace when 'the allied Gaṅgas and Gaṅga-Pallavas drove him back and a decisive battle was fought at Tiruppirambiyam near Kumbakonam resulting in the defeat of the Pāṇḍya king.'[2] The Udayēndiram plates report that in this battle 'the Western Gaṅga king Pṛithivīpati I, who was a contemporary of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Amōghavarsha I (A. D. 814–15 to 877–78), lost his life.'[3] No. 360 of 1921 at Tiruvadi in the South Arcot district, dated in the 18th year of the Gaṅga-Pallava king Nṛipatuṅgavarman, 'records a gift of 570

1. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1905, para 22.
2. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1906, para 25.
3. *Ibid.*, 1905, para 22.

Kaḷañju of gold by (Pāṇḍi) Varaguṇa-Mahārājan to the merchants (Nagarattār) of Adiyaraiyamaṅgalam for certain specified offerings to the god.' Nṛipatuṅgavarman's mother was the daughter of the Rāshṭrakūṭa Amōghavarsha.[1] From the foregoing facts it is evident that the Gaṅga-Pallavas were powerful in the Toṇḍai-nāḍu, the Gaṅgas in the Gaṅgavāḍi country and the Rāshṭrakūṭas in Mysore, and that Mārañjaḍaiyan *alias* Pāṇḍyādhirāja Varaguṇadēva had to maintain his power against these enemies of his, that frequent wars were waged by him against these enemies in his rapacity for territory, in some of which he was successful and in some he sustained a crushing defeat and lost his throne. And the Tiruvadi inscription shows that, when he made a gift of gold to the temple, he accepted a subordinate position under the Gaṅga-Pallava Nṛipatuṅgavarman, which must have happened at the beginning of his reign, for it is mentioned that the battle of Śrīpurambiyam was fought against Varaguṇa Pāṇḍya by the Western Gaṅga Pṛithivīpati I in alliance with the Gaṅga-Pallava Aparājita,[2] the successor of Nṛipatuṅga. In consonance with the vicissitudes of his political career, his inscriptions, through their dates marked by the *āṇḍu* and *edir-āṇḍu*, bring to light the breaks in his reign in the particular years. Breaks are shown in the 5th (2+3rd) year[3] of his reign, in the 7th (4+3rd) year,[4] in the 12th (2+10th) year,[5] in the 16th (4+12th) year,[6] and in other years, signifying thereby the temporary loss of his crown and throne.

Another early Pāṇḍya king Śaḍaiyamāraṇ's inscriptions are similarly dated in the current and opposite years of his reign extending to over 21 years He has been identified with Rājasiṁha III, the donor of the bigger Śiṇṇamaṇūr plates,[7] which mention that this Rājasiṁha Rājaśikhāmaṇi Mandaragauravа defeated the Chōḷa.[8] The Udayēndiram plates of Rājēndra Chōḷa I state that on an invasion of the Chōḷa country by the Pāṇḍya and the king of Ceylon, "Parāntaka I defeated the Pāṇḍya king Rājasiṁha and slew 'in an instant, at the head of a battle, an immense army despatched by the lord of Laṅka[9]'." Rājasiṁha was defeated by the Chōḷa king Parāṇ-

1. Mad. Ep. Rep. 1896. para 7.
2. *Ibid.*. 1906. para 9.
3. Nos. 66 and 68 of 1896.
4. No. 164 of 1895.
5. No. 72 of 1896.
6. No. 105 of 1905.
7. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1927-28. para 13.
8. *Ibid.*, 1907, para 15.
9. *Ibid.*, 1905. para 8.

taka I sometime before A.D. 921-22.[1] Parāntaka I fought at least three wars against the Pāṇḍyas. The first war carried into the Pāṇḍya country must have been undertaken early in his reign before the third year, if not during his father Āditya's time. The Udayēndiram plates state that his army " crushed at the head of a battle the Pāṇḍya king together with an army of elephants, horses and soldiers, seized a herd of elephants together with (the city of) Madura". The second war was waged in or before the 12th year of his reign, corresponding to A.D. 918-19, when the Pāṇḍya invaded the Chōḷa country in alliance with the king of Ceylon, and Parāntaka gained a complete victory at Vēlūr over the combined forces. The third war was fought at the end of his reign, and the Pāṇḍya king fled from his country and sought the help of the king of Ceylon and, getting no help in Ceylon, he took shelter in Kērala.[2] It is, therefore, evident that the Pāṇḍya king Śaḍaiyamāran *alias* Rājasiṁha III was frequently disturbed in his reign by the incessant expeditions and counter-expeditions of the Chōḷa Parāntaka I and on some occasions he was forced to forsake[3] his country and flee to Ceylon or Travancore, bag and baggage, and deposit his crown,[4] jewels and other valuables with the king of Ceylon. Undoubtedly, therefore, there was a cessation of his reign on those occasions and such a cessation is represented in his inscriptions by the employment of the *āṇḍu* and *edir-āṇḍu* for their dates, as 2+8th year, 2+14th year, 2+18th year and 2+19th year.[5]

There is a pretty large number of inscriptions of Vīra Pāṇḍya, 'who took the head of the Chōḷa'. The Chōḷa has been identified

1. Mad. Ep. Rep. 1908, para 29,
2. *Ibid.*, 1907, paras 32-34.
3. This is an additional direct evidence of a king losing his throne and seeking asylum at the hands of the neighbouring rulers for his own safety as well as for the safe preservation of his regalia—a clear case of an interregnum as in the case of Rājarāja III caused by his imprisonment in Śēndamaṅgalam by Kōpperuñjiṅga (Pages 4 and 20 *ante*.)
4. The King values these royal emblems as highly as and even more highly than his own life, for by losing them he would lose the esteem of his own subjects and other sympathisers and on subsequent restoration he would cut an awkward figure as a crownless king. Hence is his anxiety for their safe preservation. The victor, on his part, would deem them as specially valuable prize tending to confer great glory on him and to enhance his reputation for valour. Accordingly these insignia of royalty deposited in Ceylon by the Pāṇḍya Rājasiṁha were sought to be acquired by Parāntaka I by his invasion of Ceylon about A. D. 943 but he was unsuccessful in his attempts. However, after three-quarters of a century, Rājēndra Chōḷa I succeeded in carrying them away from Ceylon.
5. Nos. 73, 77 and 107 of 1896, 122 and 722 of 1905 and 421 of 1906.

with Āditya II Karikāla, the son of Parāntaka II Sundara-Chōḷa and the elder brother of the great Rājarāja I, who reigned for about five years from A. D. 965–66 and was dethroned by his uncle, Madhurāntaka Uttama Chōḷa in A. D. 969.[1] As stated therein, the Pāṇḍyas must have been attempting to assert their independence and to recover the possessions lost by them during the time of Parāntaka I through his three invasions of the Pāṇḍya country. Success attended the Pāṇḍya arms sometimes but it was not final, as the Pāṇḍyas were ultimately driven out of their territory and reduced to subjection by Rājarāja I and his son Rājēndra Chōḷa I. Accordingly Vīra Pāṇḍya appears to have not only gained a victory over Āditya II but also to have lost some battles in the wars against the Chōḷas and, to have consequently suffered the deprivation of his crown and kingdom and ultimately perhaps lost his life at the hands of Āditya himself. For during his reign of nearly twenty years we find about half a dozen breaks in the 6th year[2] (4+2nd year), in the 9th year[3] (4+5th year), in the 11th year[4] (4+7th year), in the 18th year[5] (15+3rd year) and in the 19th year[6] (15+4th year). All these interregnums may not be accounted for solely by Chōḷa victories on each occasion and it is possible that some of them were due to the usurpation of his throne by his rival claimants. Whatever the causes might have been, it is an indubitable fact, as indicated by the dates of the above inscriptions reckoned by the *āṇḍu* and *edir-āṇḍu*, that Vīra Pāṇḍya lost his throne for a time during each of the above years of his reign but regained it subsequently.

Similar breaks are observed in the reigns of other Pāṇḍya kings, such as Māravarman Kulaśēkhara,[7] Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya,[8] Kōnērinmaikoṇḍān Sundara Pāṇḍya,[9] Jaṭāvarman Śrīvallabha,[10] Perumāḷ Sundara Paṇḍya,[11] Parākrama Pāṇḍya"[12] Vikrama Pāṇḍya,[13] and other later Pāṇḍyas of the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries. The

1. Pages 35—36 *ante*.
2. No. 163 of 1894.
3. 16 of 1894.
4. 160 of 1894.
5. 161 of 1894.
6. 65 of 1896.
7. Nos. 119, 131, 143 of 1903, 449 of 1906.
8. No. 252 of 1901.
9. Nos. 437 of 1903, and 123 of 1904.
10. Nos. 486 of 1912, 110 of 1900.
11. Nos. 11 and 13 of 1913.
12. Nos. 199 and 204 of 1895.
13. No. 612 of 1902

history of South India has been so far written in general outline without taking cognisance of this aspect of the reigns of the Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya kings and of the significance of the double *āṇḍus* furnished by the inscriptions and, as such, material details are lacking to explain the exact causes for the breaks, the interregnums in the reigns of these kings. A special investigation in this respect is essential for a fuller knowledge of history.

The two Tiruppūvaṇam grants, regarding the interpretation of the dates of which Dr. Hultzsch expressed a doubt in the Indian Antiquary, Vol. XX, page 289, are dated, the larger one on the 4360th day of the 13th year (i.e. 12 years completed and 40th day in the 13th year) of Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkharadēva and the smaller one during the reign of his successor Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya I, 'who presented the Chōḷa country'. Prof. Kielhorn has calculated the date of the larger one in the 25th year of Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara as corresponding to Saturday, the 29th November A.D. 1214.[1] Dr. Hultzsch has extracted five dates in the above volume of the Indian Antiquary. The date in the extract No. A is the 4360th day of the 13th year of the reign of Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara, that in No. B is the 25th year of the reign of Rājagambhīradēva *alias* Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara, that in No. C is a day in the 12th year opposite to the 13th year, that in No. D is the 11th year opposite to the 13th year and that in No. E is the 10th year opposite to the 13th year. These dates of Nos. C, D and E are amenable to the interpretation furnished by the Tiruvēndipuram inscription of Rājarāja III, though the *edir-āṇḍu* given by them is 12 in C, 11 in D and 10 in E. However high or low the figure may be, the interpretation of it is the same as that in the case of the Tiruvēndipuram inscription. If 'Yāṇḍu 15 vadil edirām-āṇḍu,' *i. e.*, the 15 + 1st year, of Rājarāja's reign gives a total regnal period of 16 years for him, and signifies a restoration after an interregnum in the current year on the date of the inscription after the 15th year had passed, *i.e.*, in the year of the figure standing in the second place, equally so the 'padinmūnrāvadin-edir panniraṇḍām āṇḍu' the 'padin-onrām-āṇḍu' and the 'pattām-āṇḍu' of Nos. C, D and E, *i.e.*, 13 + 12th year, 13 + 11th year and 13 + 10th year, should yield a total regnal period of 23, 24 and 25 years and the figure in the second place should signify the restoration to the throne after the interregnum. As such, it would indicate that after a continuous reign of 13 years according to the figure in the first place, there was

1. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1900, para 11.

in each case a long period of interregnum up to the 10th year, the 11th year and the 12th year, consecutively which in the case of different kings might be possible but in the case of one and the same king would look absurd. In the dates of these extracts C, D and E, and in another quoted on p. 289 of the Ind. Ant, Vol XX., *viz.*, 13+8th year, it may be noted that the first figure 13 is constant, while the second figure varies, 8, 10, 11 and 12. This is also the case with the dates of the inscriptions of Śaḍaiyanmāran, Mārañjaḍaiyan. Jaṭāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya,[1] Parākrama Pāṇḍya[2] and others. In the case of the Chōḷa kings so far as we have observed above, the second figure is usually 1, while the first figure varies, such that after a continuous reign of the period of years given in the figure in the first place, a temporary break could be accepted as possible during the year given in the first place or that in the second place. But in the Pāṇḍya inscriptions the position of the figures would, according to this basis, appear to have been reversed. The reason for the interregnum in the reigns of the Chōḷa kings is usually their deprivation of the throne by a foreign enemy, while civil wars between the rival claimants to the throne have rarely come to our notice. In the case of the Pāṇḍya kings particularly, there have always been a number of co-rulers as co-regents or otherwise, some of whom waged civil wars as rival claimants to the throne for equal or superior authority among the existing number of rulers at the time or even for gaining the position of a ruler along with the others, if they comprised the limited number of five as sometimes noted by foreign travellers,[3] and hence kept out of the position for want of a vacancy. Consequently we come across civil wars for succession to the Pāṇḍya throne, while there is almost an absence of them in Chōḷa history. And in these wars of succession, it must happen that the crowned rulers are sometimes dethroned by powerful rival claimants to the throne and the dethroned rulers make strenuous attempts at regaining their old position. These processes are amply illustrated in the long war of Pāṇḍya succession in the 12th century which began when 'Parākrama Pāṇḍya was besieged in Madura by his enemy Kulaśēkhara,[4]' and the fraternal war early in the 14th century which began with the murder of Māravarman Kulaśēkhara by his legitimate son Jaṭāvarman Sundara Pāṇḍya, to avenge which the illegitimate son Jaṭāvarman

1 Nos. 613 and 614 of 1902.
2. Nos. 199 and 204 of 1895.
3. Dr. S. K. Aiyyangar : South India and Her Muhammadan Invaders, P. 57-58.
4. Mad. Ep. Rep., 1899, Paras 23 to 31.

Vira Pāṇḍya marched against his half-brother.[1] Hence up to the time of their dethronement, the reign of the crowned rulers would run continuously and on reinstalment the regnal years would be reckoned as the *edir-āṇḍu* or the opposite years which would be a constant figure, unless dethroned again. If a ruler gains his throne for the first time after having been deprived and kept out of it by his rivals for some years, e.g., five years, or regains it, on once losing it, after a few years, say five, from the time of his dethronement, this five years' period would necessarily be tagged on to the period of his continuous rule but indicated as a constant period of five opposite years. It must be this kind of constant periods, such as we find in the inscriptions of Śaḍaiyanmāran as 2+8th year, 2+14th, 2+18th and 2+19th years, of Jaṭāvarman Vira-Paṇḍya as 2+5th and 2+12th years, of Jaṭāvarman Kulaśēkhara as 13+8th, 13+10th, 13+11th and 13+12th years, of Jaṭilavarman Parākrama Pāṇḍya as 31+1st, 31+2nd, 31+9th years, etc., that must have suggested the theory of Mr. C. V. Narayana Aiyar 'that the date opposite to which other dates follow must be constant in the case of the same king'[2]. It can be constant only with reference to a particular period of interregnum and it must vary if there are more such periods. Consequently the constant period can represent only the period of interregnum but not the progressive period of reign. This point can be illustrated from the inscriptions themselves. No. 91 of 1907 gives its date as the 9+4th year and the 1438th day. 1438 days make up 3 years and 343 days falling into the 4th year, such that the 9th year quoted first in the date figures has not been taken into account at all. The same inscription furnishes another date, the 9th year and the 1430 day, i.e., 3 years and 335 days only passing in the 4th year. Again No. 97 of 1907 quotes the 9th year and the 1403rd day, *i.e.*, three years completed and 308th day passing in the 4th year. There is no account taken of the first 9 years. Likewise No. 111 of 1907 mentions the date as the 3+7th year and equates it with the 3rd year and 2594th day. 2594 days make up full 7 years and 39 days. As the inscription is stated to be dated in the 3+7th year, it must be understood that the 7th year has not clearly run out, leaving a balance of 39 days falling into the 8th year. There must be still some more days after the 2594th day left to complete the 7th year. Hence the balance of 39 days and in addition some more days by which the 7th year was to have been

1. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri. The Pandyan Kingdom, pages 201-208; Dr. S. K. Aiyangar: South India and Her Muhammadan Invaders, pp. 95-99.

2. Prof. Nilakanta Sastri: The Pāṇḍyan Kingdom, page 8, footnote.

completed should be pushed back into the 3rd year for which a separate account of its days has not been furnished by the inscription, so as to leave the 7th year still incomplete. This shows that in the latter part of the 3rd year itself the reign of the king commenced. It must be equally so in the case of the 9th year of the two inscriptions noticed above, Nos. 91 and 97 of 1907. Further, No. 109 of 1907 gives its date as the 3+1+1+1st year and states that it was the 3rd year and the 1072nd day of the king's reign. 1072 days make up 2 years and 342 days falling in the 3rd year, represented by 1+1+1, in which we cannot be certain that in the 3 years the reign of the king was continuous and complete for each year, so much so that a certain period which may not exceed a full year out of the 1072 days of reign must have been passed before the close of the 3 years' duration covered by the first figure 3 of the date. Again, No. 124 of 1907 quotes the date as the 20th year and 849th day, which falls into the 3rd year as the 119th day in it, provided any portion of the 20 years had not formed part of his actual reign. No. 497 of 1909 expresses the date as 13 years and 1119 days, which cover only 3 years and 29 days. There is no cognisance of the 13 years at all. It is, therefore, seen that the constant figure, as 9 in the first three instances, 3 in the next two instances and 20 and 13 in the next two, are altogether left out of account in reckoning the actual period of reign and only the varying or the progressive figures are indicated as the actual regnal years. As such, the constant figures indicate the period of break of reign, an interregnum, expressed as the *edir-āṇḍu,* the opposite year, *i.e.*, the period of some time during that year which is considered to run opposite or counter to the regular and continuous course of the reign of the particular king. Hence in the conventional method of expressing the interregnum it must occupy the second place in the date so as to be in consonance with the practice observed in marking them in the Chōḷa inscrtptions. Thus the 13+8th, 13+10th, 13+11th and 13+12th years[1] should rather be expressed as 8+13th year, 10+13th year, 11+13th year and 12+13th year, the first figure showing the progressive reign and the second figure the constant period of the interregnum. But as already pointed out,[2] this is an initial deprivation of the reign when he must have been prevented from coming to the throne at all, and not an ousting from the throne after having occupied it for some time. Hence the constant figure indicating the

1. Ind. Ant.. Vol. XX, page 289.

2. *Ante.* p, 44.

initial deprivation of the throne stands first and is followed by a varying figure indicating the progress of the reign after the constant period of initial deprivation.

Thus the dates of the extracts in the Ind. Ant, from the Tirup-pūvaṇam grant of Kulaśēkhara would need to be interpreted that, after being kept out of his throne for a period of 13 years from the date of his original claim to the throne, Kulaśēkhara regained his throne and then ruled continuously for 12 years from the date of his regaining it. Similarly in the case of Śaḍaiyamāran, the constant or uniform figure 2 represents the short period of deprivation of his throne that occurred at the commencement of his reign and the progressive figures represent the continuity of his reign after his regaining the throne. Otherwise, the interpretation in these cases as applied to the Chōḷa inscriptions, and especially in such instances as the 2+42nd year of Jaṭilavarman Kulaśēkharadēva, with the high figure of 42 in the second place, would connote an absurd condition of things.

So far the dates with double *āṇḍu* alone have been considered. In a few inscriptions occur dates with triple and quadruple *āṇḍu*, as 4+1+Ist year;[1] 17+1+1st year;[2] 20+1+1st year;[3] a four figure date of 2+(4 ?)+1+1st year;[4] and a five figure date of 4+1+1+1+1st year:[5] Two figures in the date represent the current year and the opposite year indicating a continuous reign for a definite period followed by a break or interregnum and restoration. Similarly three figures should indicate a second break aftar a restoration followed by a second restoration. And four and five figures should likewise indicate further breaks in the reign after each restoration followed by further restorations. Thus the date 4+1+1+1+1st year of No 358 of 1907 shows that there was a continuous reign at the start for a period of about 4 years, unless the first figure, here 4, occurs as a constant figure, that there was a break in the 4th or 5th year and a restoration followed in the 4+1st or 5th year; subsequently in the 5th or 6th year of the reign (4+1+1st year) there was another break followed by a restoration in the 6th year; that once more occurred a break of reign in the 6th or the 7th year with a restoration in the 7th year (4+1+1+1st year); that there occurred a break once again

1. Nos. 96 and 678 of 1905 ; and 364 of 1907.
2. No, 416 of 1907.
3. Nos. 107 and 309 of 1907.
4. No. 371 of 1927.
5. No. 358 of 1907.

in the 7th or the 8th year followed by an ultimate restoration in the 8th year of reign (4+1+1+1+1st year). The prime fact to note in the case of a date furnished by a double, triple or any higher figure, therefore, is a restoration to the lost throne, the regaining of the regalia with the kingdom, after a loss of them earlier in the same year or in the previous year. Restoration necessarily connotes former possession, subsequent loss and present recovery and possession. The *edir-āṇḍu* thus signifies restoration to and possession of the throne after an anterior loss of it.

The date 4+1+1st year, *i. e.*, the 6th year, is furnished by Nos. 96 and 678 of 1905 pertaining to the time of Māravarman Sundara Pāṇḍya. The same date, *i e.*, the 6th year, is also furnished by No. 95 of 1905 but in a slightly different manner, as 4+2nd year. The total period of reign is no doubt 6 years in the two cases, but there is a little difference between the two, so far as the breaks and restorations are concerned. In the date 4+1+1st year are indicated two breaks followed by two restorations in the two oppsite years, *i. e.*, one in each year, while in the date 4+2nd year a single continuous break extending into 2 years followed by a final restoration in the 2nd year is indicated, so much so that in the latter case with the continuous break for nearly two years the first restoration in the first year is not indicated but it is omitted.

This principle of interregnum and recovery of the lost throne which has been applicable to the dates of the Chōḷa and the Pāṇḍya kings expressed as the *āṇḍu* and *edir-āṇḍu* of the king's reign can be applied equally appropriately to the dates of the kings of other dynasties. The Tirunelli copper-plate grant of Bhāskara Ravivarman, edited by Dr. Hultzsch in the Ind. Ant., Vol, XX, pages 285 to 292, is dated in 'the 46th *āṇḍu* opposite to the current *yāṇḍu* of the king', while the grant to the Cochin Jews is dated 'in the 36th year (*āṇḍu*) opposite to the 2nd year (*āṇḍu*).' As in the case of the Chōḷa and Pāṇḍya kings' dates, the 46th year opposite to the current year shows that Ravivarman had a continuous reign of 46 years, that in the course of the 46th or the 47th year occurred an interregnum in his reign followed by restitution to his throne in the 47th year as indicated by the *edir-āṇḍu*. Similarly, according to the Cochin grant, dated in 'the 36th *āṇḍu* opposite to the 2nd *āṇḍu*,' Ravivarman lost his throne in the 36th or the 37th year, the period of interregnum caused thereby extended to about 2 years, he then regained his lost throne during the 2nd year and continued to reign

thereafter. How he came to lose his throne on the two occasions is unanswerable in the present state of historical facts and knowledge. A detailed investigation by scholars and historians on the above lines should clarify the situation.

It is not only in the case of the chief dynastic rulers of South India, the Chōḷas, Pāṇḍyas and Kēraḷas, that we observe the dating of some of their inscriptions by the *āṇḍu* and the *edir-āṇḍu*. We also come across an inscription, No. 424 of 1905, bearing the double figure date 8+1st year, in the reign of Rājanārāyaṇa Śambuvarāya Tirumallinādan. The Śambuvarāyas, who were subordinates of the Chōḷas during the 12th and 13th centuries, emerged into a state of quasi-independence on the dissolution of the Chōḷa empire in the third quarter of the 13th century and the dismemberment of the Pāṇḍya empire at the beginning of the 14th century, when the Hoysaḷas from the west and the Telugu—Chōḷas and the Kākatīyas from the north endeavoured to conquer the territories which formed the old Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam. Rājanārāyaṇa Śambuvarāya ruled from Śaka 1259[1] (A.D. 1337) as an almost independent king, and the adoption of the double figure date in vogue in the case of the Chōḷas and the Pāṇḍyas from the 10th century onwards, as we are able to observe, indicates this assumption of independence. Probably the damaged inscription from Tennēri in the Chingleput district recording an order of a certain Śambuvarāya (whose full name is not given in it) 'making a gift of 3 *vēli* of land to the temple with effect from the month of Āḍi in the year opposite the 11th year' also belongs to Rājanārāyaṇa Śambuvarāya Tirumallinādan. As for the probable cause of the break of reign in the 8th or 9th year and in the 11th or 12th year, it must have been due to the attacks of Hoysaḷa Vīra Vallāḷa III or the Kākatīyas; or even the neighbouring provincial chiefs, such as the Yādavarāyas ruling from Kāḷahasti, Tirupati and Nārāyaṇavanam in the Chittoor district in which places their inscriptions occur in large numbers; the Kāḍavarāyas at Śēndamangalam ruling over parts of the Chingleput and South Arcot districts; and the Gaṇḍagōpālas of the Telugu—Chōḷa family of Nellore who occupied Kāñchī time and again together with the intervening part of the old Toṇḍaimaṇḍalam country. Further, after the assault of Malik Kafur on the Yādava capital, Dēvagiri, and the crushing defeat, submission, imprisonment and release of its king, Yādava Rāmachandra, in A.D. 1307-8, and his subsequent attack on Hoysaḷa

1. Mad. Ep. Rep. 1900, para, 90.

Vīra Vallāḷa III's capital Dvārasamudra and his expedition into the Pāṇḍya country down to Rāmēśvaram during 1310–11, which by weakening the power and authority of the Pāṇḍya princes ruling in the south, enabled the ambitions Kēraḷa prince, Ravivarman Saṅgrāmadhīra, to undertake an audacious invasion and conquest of the Pāṇḍya empire up to Kāñchī whereat he crowned himself for a second time in A.D. 1313, and which helped the counter-invasion of the Kākatīya general Muppiḍi Nāyaka and the occupation of Kāñchī and the installation of Mānavīra there in A.D. 1316 by him, after driving out Saṅgrāmadhīra from Kāñchī; and the final raid of South India by the Muhammadan army despatched by Muhammad Tughlak against Dvārasamudra and Madura in 1327 and the establishment of the Sultanate at Madura in the same year, the ruin of the southern country was complete and there was left no strong power to rule over the entire territory. During this turmoil and confusion, strifes and wars among the surviving dynastic rulers and subordinate chiefs were the order of the day, until their reduction to allegiance of the Vijayanagara kingdom by Kumāra-Kampaṇa and his generals in the third quarter of the 14th century. In this state of affairs, the Śambuvarāyas also played their part.

So far the occurrence of the double figure dates of *āṇḍu* and *edir-āṇḍu* has been noticed in the inscriptions that come from the Tamil districts alone. We also find these double figure dates furnished by some of the epigraphs secured from the Telugu districts[1] lying in the extreme north of the peninsular region, so much so that the convention of adopting this method of indicating a restoration to the lost throne by the employment of the *āṇḍu* and *edir-āṇḍu*, which has been observed to prevail from the 10th century onwards throughout South India roughly from the Mahānadī in the north to Cape Comorin in the south, must have developed under some recognised authoritative sanction. The adoption of such a method cannot be deemed to have been a matter of indivual freak or temperament, exultation or vainglory to announce to the world an implied antecedent loss of throne in the feat of regaining the lost throne.

1. I am highly obliged to Rao Bahadur C. R. Krishnamacharlu, Retired Government Epigraphist, who drew my attention to the references in the Mad. Ep. Rep. for 1935-36 to the inscriptions Nos. 341, 449 and 450 of 1893 from Drākshārāma in the Godavari district, published in S. I. I., IV, as Nos. 1224, 1384 and 1385; and 153, 154, 157, 164 and 173 of 1896 from Mukhaliṅgam in the Parlakimedi taluk of the Ganjam district, published as Nos. 1019, 1020, 1023, 1030 and 1039 in Vol. V. of S. I. I.

Nos. 341, 449 and 450 of 1893 from Drākshārāma belong to the reign of Sarvalōkāśraya Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja VII *alias* Tribhuvanachakravarti Śrī Kulōttuṅga Chōḍadēvara, entitled Śrī Pṛithivīvallabha, Mahārājādhirāja, Paramēśvara, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Ravikulatilaka, Chōḍakulaśēkhara, Pāṇḍyakulāntaka.................. Vikrama-Chōḍa, Vijayābharaṇa, Rājakēsarivarma, Permanaḍigaḷu and Gaṅga-Kāvēri-paryanta-dharitrīpati. Undoubtedly the king mentioned in them is Kulōttuṅga I who reigned for 50 years from A.D. 1070 to 1120. No. 341 furnishes the Śaka year 1043 corresponding to the regnal year 49+1 in these words: "Śrī Vishṇuvardhana Mahārājulu Pravarddhamāna vijaya-rājya saṁvatsaramulu 49 agu śrāhi edurēṇḍu." *Edur-ēṇḍu* is the Telugu equivalent of the Tamil expression *edir-āṇḍu*, the opposite year. The break in this Chāḷukya-Chōḷa king's reign during the 45th or 46th year has been discussed earlier[1] with reference to the Tennēri inscription. Here we come across another implied break during the penultimate or final year of his reign, *i.e.*, in the 49th or the 50th year, and his recovery of the throne subsequently in the 50th year. Also No. 450 of 1893 mentions an *edir-āṇḍu* opposite to the 49th regnal year of Sarvalōkāśraya Vishṇuvardhana Mahārāja and registers the grant of land made on the 47th day of the said opposite year by Śrī Parāntaka Asalarāyaru. Further, No. 449 of 1893 gives another *edir-āṇḍu* anent to the 47th regnal year, during which the grant of land situated in the midst of Eṇḍepiballeṟa in Vēṅgga-nāṇḍu *alias* Kulōttuṅgachōḷa-maṇḍalam was registered, while the inscription itself would appear to have been dated on the 431st day (*i.e.* 1 full year and 71 days) from the 47th year. Thus these opposite years, *edur-ēṇḍu* or *edir-āṇḍu*, coupled in these records with the regular, continuous and progressive regnal years 47 and 49 of Kulōttuṅga I definitely signify his recovery of throne and kingdom each time after a loss of them prior to such recovery. The cause of this loss of the throne must have been the unsuccessful invasions of Kulōttuṅga I against the Western Chāḷukya and the Kaliṅga[2] kingdoms in the west and the north and against the Pāṇḍya kingdom in the south, and their retaliation.

1. Pages 33-35 *ante*.

2. No. 271 of 1896—noticed as No. 142 under Dīrghāsi, Berhampur taluk of the Ganjam district, in Prof. V. Rangachari's 'Topographical List of Inscriptions', Vol. I—supplies a clue in such situations. Prof. Rangachariar mentions that the inscription "records, in Śaka 997, the building of a *nāṭyaśāla* in front of the temple of Durga and the gift of two lamps by Vanapati, the son of a Brāhman Gōkarṇa of Ātrēya-gōtra and door-keeper *(Pratihārin)* and commander-in-chief of the Gaṅga king Rājarāja (1068-1076) as well as his wife Padmādēvi. He defeated the king of Vēṅgī and other

enemies, viz., the Chōḍa king, the Utkala, Kimiḍi (Ganjam district), Kōsala, Giḍrisiṅgi and Oḍḍa (Orissa) whose king was later on reinstated by Rājarāja's son Anantavarman. Ep. Ind. IV, pages 314-318." The Vēṅgī king is said to be Vijayāditya VII who was the paternal uncle of Kulōttuṅga I and who usurped the throne of Vēṅgī in A.D. 1062 on the death of the Eastern Chāḷukya Rājarāja I, the elder brother of Vijayāditya and the father of Kulōttuṅga I, whereby Kulōttuṅga was kept out of the Eastern Chāḷukya throne for about 8 years from 1062 to 1070 until he contrived to occupy the Chōḷa throne in the latter year.

This information relating to the conquests of the Eastern Gaṅga king Rājarāja pertains, no doubt, to his period of reign from A.D. 1068 to 1076 but suggests some reverses in or before Śaka 997 (A.D. 1075) for Kulōttuṅga I who was the Chōḍa king that was contemporaneous in his early career for half a dozen years from 1070 to 1076 with the Gaṅga king Rājarāja. The war or wars that led to these reverses of Kulōttuṅga I are inferred from the inscription recording the installation of his second son Rājarāja as the Viceroy of Vēṅgī on July 7, 1076, when a grant of villages was made to Mummuḍi Bhīma for valuable services rendered to Kulōttuṅga in the wars against the 'Gaṅga, Kaliṅga and Kuntala' (Western Chāḷukya kings) (Mad. Ep. Rep. 1922, page 97) (Sewell Histl. Inspns., p. 85).

The statements in the Piṭhāpuram inscription that, on the abrupt forsaking of Vēṅgī by Vikrama Chōḷa, son of Kulōttuṅga I, in A.D. 1118, 'he went to protect the Chōḷa-maṇḍala', 'when he heard of the vacancy of the throne' of the Chōḷas, that he 'at once went to Kāñchī and was crowned' and that thereby the province of Vēṅgī 'become devoid of a ruler', point to some political upheaval in the Chōḷa country proper at this time. Sewell (Histl. Inspns., p. 96) mentions under date A.D. 1118, December 18, that "proof of the statement that Vikrama Chōḷa lost his hold on the Vēṅgī country for a time immediately on his departure thence for Kāñchī is given by an inscription of this date which shows the Western Chāḷukya Vikramāditya VI ruling over 'the Vēṅgī 14,000 country'."

These facts are more clearly connected together in the Introduction to the 'Inscriptions of Vikrama Chōḷa' in S. I. I., Vol. III, page 180.—" The statement of the Piṭhāpuram inscription of Mallapadēva that, after the departure of Vikrama Chōḷa to the Chōḷa country, the country of Vēṅgī became devoid of a ruler suggests that his absence resulted in political trobles. The Piṭhāpuram inscription of Pṛithvīśvara reports that Kulōttuṅga I bestowed the Vēṅgi 16,000 on "his adopted son" Chōḍa of Velanāṇḍu (Ep Ind. IV, page 50) An inscription of this chief at Drākshārāma shows that in A.D. 1120-21 he was a vassal of the Western Chāḷukya king Vikramāditya VI (*Ibid*, page 37 f.). It may be concluded from these two statements that, when Vikrama Chōḷa went to the South, Kulōttuṅga I entrusted Vēṅgī to Chōḍa of Velanāṇḍu, but that the latter became a dependent of Vikramāditya VI who took advantage of Vikrama Chōḷa's absence in the Chōḷa country as co-regent of his father and of the subsequent death of Kulōttuṅga I for conquering the Vēṅgī province. The inscriptions of Vikramāditya VI at Drākshārāma range from A D. 1120-21 (Nos. 345 and 393 of 1893) to 1123-24 (No. 359 of 1893). Shortly after, Vikrama Chōḷa must have reconquered his northern dominions. For, two inscriptions of his reign at Chēbrōlu and Niḍubrōlu are dated in A.D. 1127 and 1135."

It is thus evident that either on account of separate individual assaults or concerted attacks from the three principal enemies of the Chōḷas, viz., the Pāṇḍyas, the Western Chāḷukyas and the Eastern Gaṅgas of Kaliṅga, the Chōḷa monarch Kulōttuṅga I was overpowered and unseated from his throne, whereby 'the vacancy of the throne' of the Chōḷas occurred in A.D. 1119, which obliged Vikrama Chōḷa to forsake the Vēṅgī kingdom 'devoid of a ruler' and hurry up to Kāñchī where he was crowned; according to the Piṭhāpuram inscription of Mallapadēva, 'he went to

Of the 5 inscriptions from Mukhaliṅgam, No 157 of 1896 is the earlierst in date with the Śaka year 1035 which is said to be the *edurēṇḍu* after the 30th year of the progressive reign of Śrī Chōḍa-Gaṅgadēvara. The next in date is No. 173 of 1896 with Śaka 1(o) 43 which was the *edurēṇḍu* anent to the 45th year of the progressive reign of Śrīmat Chōḍa-Gaṅgadēvara. A fragment appended to No. 157 mentions the opposite year of Śrī Chōḍa-Gaṅgadēvara corresponding to the Śaka year 1058. The other three inscriptions belong to the reign of Śrīmat Anantavarmadēva, Nos. 153 and 154 of 1896 being dated in the Śaka year 1056 which corresponded to the opposite year anent to the king's progressive regnal year 59, and No. 164 of 1896 in Śaka 1063 corresponding to the *eduṛēṇḍu* anent to the king's 65th regnal year. The Śaka year 1035 of No. 157 equated with the 30+1st year of Chōḍa-Gaṅga yields Śaka 1004 (A.D. 1082) as the first year of his reign[1], while Śakā 1043 of No. 173 equated with the same king's 45+1st year gives Śaka 997 (A.D. 1075) as his first year. The Śaka year 1058 of the fragmentary inscription would be the 61st regnal year. Likewise Śaka 1056 of Nos. 153 and 154 corresponding to the 59+1st year of Anantavarma yields Śaka 996 (A.D. 1074) as the initial year of his reign, while Śaka 1063 of No. 164 corresponding to the 65+1st year yields Śaka 997 (A.D. 1075) as his initial regnal year. Thus the reigns of Chōḍa-Gaṅga and Anantavarma overlap each other, both the reigns commencing in Śaka 996-997 (A.D. 1074-75). Though the inscriptions are registered under two apparently different royal names, they really belong to a single king,

protect the Chōḷa-maṇḍala'. This year A.D. 1118 is the 48th-49th year of the reign of Kulōttuṅga I. The Tennēri and the Drākshārāma inscriptions note the *edir-āṇḍu* or *edur-ēṇḍu* dates for his 46th (45+1st) year, 48th (47+1st) year and 50th (49+1st) year, and, in the light of the above definite facts supplied by the Piṭhāpuram and other records, it is an inevitable and incontrovertible conclusion that Kulōttuṅga I lost his throne during each of these years, that consequently interregnums occurred in the 45-46th year, 47-48th year and 49-50th year and that he regained his lost throne for once in the 45+1st or 46th year, again in 47+1st or 48th year and finally in 49+1st or 50th year.

These statements of the inscriptions supply further incontestable proof of the soundness and correctness of the interpretation of the *edir-āṇḍu*, the key to the solution of which has been originally provided by the Tiruvēndipuram inscription of Rājarāja III's 15+1st regnal year. Vide also page 41 *ante*.

1. There appears to be some mistake in the regnal year given in the inscription as corresponding to the Śaka year 1035, for, while the fragmentary inscription and No. 173 of 1896 yield Śaka 997 as the initial year of Chōḍa Gaṅga, No. 157 of 1896 works out to Śaka 1004 as the initial year of the same Chōḍa Gaṅga, which is untenable, as it would be the 7th regnal year. Hence the regnal year furnished by No. 157 of 1896 must be 37+1st year, and not 30+1st year.

the Eastern Gaṅga king, Anantavarma Chōḍa Gaṅga, who ruled Kaliṅga for 72 years from Śaka 996-997 (A.D. 1074-75) to Śaka 1068-1069 (A.D. 1146-47),[1] while his father and predecessor Rājarāja ruled from A.D. 1068 to 1076. As in the case of Kulōttuṅga I, the *edurēṇḍu* must have been occasioned by his defeats in his wars against the Chōḷas[2], the Eastern Chāḷukyas and the Western Chāḷukyas entailing the loss of his throne and kingdom followed by their recovery during each of the years mentioned in the above records, viz., in the 37+1st or 38th year, 45+1st or 46th year, 59+1st or 60th year, 60+1st or 61st year and 65+1st or 66th year of his reign.

As I have more than once made a request in the course of the above discussion I appeal to scholars and historians to endeavour earnestly to verify for themselves the validity and applicability of the interpretation of the *edir-āṇḍu* or *edur-ēṇḍu* set out herein as disclosed by the Tiruvēndipuram inscription of Rājarāja III of the 15+1st year in conjunction with other inscriptions relating to the different kings noticed above. The political history of South India so far constructed furnishes only a general outline of events relating to the different reigns and periods, eschewing intricate details the explanation, incorporation and correlation of which should surely serve to make such history more intelligible, full-summed and comprehensive. As it is, it is neither complete nor accurate in detail but only tentative. In such a state of our knowledge, it is impossible to adduce greater details of definite and unassailable facts in incontestable proof of the interpretation. It is up to the research scholars and historians to sift the details patiently from the accumulated sources, especially the lithic and literary records, interpret them judiciously and correlate them to the known facts and events and thus augment our knowledge of South Indian History. For long Bhārathī, the Muse of Indian History, has made an imperative call to them to carry on an earnest, deep and thorough investigation of the materials and compile an accurate and comprehensive history.

———

1. Nos. 387 and 388 of 1896 noted as Nos. 135 and 136 of Araśavilli village in the Chicacole taluk of the Ganjam district in Prof V. Rangachari's 'Topographical List of Inscriptions', Vol. I, both of the same regnal year 72 equated in No. 135 with Saka 1068 and in No. 136 with Saka 1069

2. Vide note 2 on page 51 *ante*.

NOTICES OF MANUSCRIPTS

I

A SANSKRIT ENCYCLOPÆDIA

In Manuscript

[The following article was written by Babu Bhagwan Das of Benares after he examined the work. He paid a visit to Vizagapatam in the summer of 1900 when his attention was drawn to the life-work of the author. The article was evidently intended to be published in some Oriental Journal but it had not the fortune of being so and has been lying all these long years in the house of the grandson of the author and it is now published with the object of bringing the existence of such a unique work to the notice of Oriental scholars.—Ed)

Having had occasion to spend a few weeks at the seaside town Vizagapatam Waltair (on the East Coast Railway in the Madras Presidency) in the last summer season and being interested in Sanskrit Literature, I came to learn there that Pandit Sri Paravastu Venkata Rangacharya Aryavaraguru, whom the Government had deservedly honoured with the title of Mahamahopadhyaya, had died recently, after spending the greater portion of a long life in compiling an Encyclopædia of all available Sanskrit learning. I went to the Pandit's house taking with me a copy of the new edition of Raja Radhakanta's *Śabdakalpadruma*. I met Pandit S. P. V. Ranganatha-swami Ayyavaralugaru, the grandson of the deceased Pandit. This young man about 22 or 23 years, is himself a good scholar of Sanskrit as I could see from the way he spoke it, that being the only language of communication between us, our mother-tongues being different and mutually unknown and English not being well-known to him. From him I learnt that his father, also a good Pandit, has passed away in the life-time of his (the young man's) grandfather, leaving the old man to labour at his life-work practically alone, for the young man could not give much help except in the very last years. This life-work of the Mahamahopadhyaya was the compilation of an exhaustive Encyclopædia of Sanskrit learning and he lived to complete it; but only just to complete it, for he died a few months later, still engaged in putting final touches to the work here and there.

For nearly fifty years the old man worked at the vast enterprise practically single-handed and it is sad that he should have passed away without being able to bring the work before the public; and his grandson naturally feels the disappointment keenly

I asked him to show me the work and he did so. Four oblong boxes, each about three feet long and 1½ broad and 1½ deep, and full of uniform bundles of Mss., six inches by 3 or 4, represent the work. The Mss. are in closely and finely written Telugu character. India has been a country of large literary enterprises. But on seeing this vast mass of Mss. I felt that even here there were not many instances to match this of the single-handed completion of such a gigantic task.

I asked the young man to help me to compare a few words with the same in the *Śabdakalpadruma.* He then told me that with the help of a nobleman of the town, viz. the Maharaja Gajapati Row, and others, his grandfather had printed and published, in Telugu character, a condensed and abridged version of the letter *A* only and he brought out a volume of about 400 pages, Demy Qto. We compared a few words, he reading out the Telugu character (the language being, of course, the Sanskrit) of his book and I the Sanskrit of the copy of the *Śabdakalpadruma.*

The method of the two works, we found, was different. The *Śabdakalpadruma* is mostly quotations from Purānas. The other work — which by the way was named the *Śabdārthasarvasva* and appears to have been executed in entire independence of all previous modern Sanskrit dictionaries and encyclopædias — consits of original digests of information, scientifically arranged. E.g. the word *āhāra* in Radhakanta's work is treated entirely by means of quotations from the Purāṇas. In the *Śabdārthasarvasva* I found a complete little treatise on the kinds of foods and their divisions and sub-divisions from various standpoints and the various processes and transformations undergone by food in the course of digestion and assimilation etc., according, of course, to the old Sanskrit works on Medicine.

Then we ran over page after page comparing only the number of words. I found that the number was, on the whole, larger in the *Śabdārthasarvasva* than the *Śabdakalpadruma,* but that the omissions were not altogether on one side. The *Śabdakalpadruma* also contained words here and there which were not mentioned in the other; but where the *Śabdakalpadruma* showed two extra words, the other showed ten.

I came away with the impression that the deceased Pandit's vast labour should not be left to the white ants; and that the work was one which thoroughly deserves to see the light. The fact that it was done single-handed does not detract from its merits under the circumstances. The foundations of Sanskrit literature in all branches are complete in themselves. Later literary activity does not touch

them and remains more or less ineffective also with a very few exceptions. Hence there is no such need for constant revision and adjustment upto date by specialists and experts as is necessary in the case of European Encyclopædias dealing with ever-changing and ever-growing sciences; and in the present case the Pandit added to his immense learning a singularly fair and impartial spirit. In every case of a philosophical term, I noticed that he marshalled his conspectus of opinions impartially without giving any prominence or precedence to Dvaita or Viśiṣṭādvaita or Advaita or such like.

If therefore, a competent editor were found and the means secured by the liberality of Government or Indian Chief or by means of advance subscriptions and the work brought out in periodical fasciculi in Devanagari character, I believe it would prove of considerable use and be appreciated largely in this age of revived interest in Sanskrit learning.

I promised the young man and myself to do what lay in my power to at least bring to the notice of the public the existence of the work.

BHAGAVAN DAS.

II

CATUH-ṢAṢṬI-VIDYĀSAṄGRAHA

No. 86.

The development of Sanskrit literature can be estimated by the number of encyclopædias, which in concise form represent the vast mass of literary and scientific thought of the people. A good number of works of this category are known, viz. *Daivajña-vilāsa* of the scholars of Lolla family, *Catuḥṣaṣṭi-kalā* and *Viśrānti-cintāvinoda* of Bhoja, *Śivatattva-ratnākara* of Basaveśvara, *Abhilaṣitārtha-cintāmaṇi*, *Vīramitrodaya*, *Hariharacaturaṅga* etc These are useful encyclopædias for reference. Great kings like Bhoja, Madana, Someśvara etc. contributed large treatises in this direction. Sanskrit being the common tongue all over India from time immemorial, all literary progress found its record in that language. The Ms. under notice belongs to this category.

At present it is only the S. V. O. I. Library that is known to possess a Ms. of the work under notice. The work is not found in the collections of any other Ms. Library nor is it mentioned in Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum*. Written on paper in Telugu script, the Ms. is fairly old, much worm-eaten, heavily injured and liable to break at every touch. It bears the Acc. No. 86. The Ms. is

incomplete. A transcript in Devanāgarī was recently made out of this old and injured paper Ms. and this bears the stock No. 6668. The Ms. contains about 5155 granthas and consists of 696 pages. For the sake of easy reference, all the page Nos. in this note are from the transcript.

The Ms. contains at the beginning an exhaustive index to the contents of the work, but it runs upto 48 vidyas only and two leaves are left blank thereafter. In the introductory verses, the author of the work, Puruṣottama, invokes God Lakṣmī-Ramaṇa, more popularly known as Śrīnivāsa, the presiding deity at Tirumalai and gives some information about himself. The Ms. begins as follows :

प्रणम्य लक्ष्मीरमणं सर्वशास्त्रानुसारतः ।
प्रवक्ष्येऽहं चतुष्षष्टिविद्यासङ्ग्रहनामकम् ॥
विराजते महाराजः श्रीवेङ्कटगिरिप्रभुः ।
कुमारयाचभूपालः सर्वज्ञ इतिशब्दभाक् ॥
तत्कृपारक्षणाद्धन्यः कौण्डिन्यः पुरुषोत्तमः ।
षट्यिष्यामि विद्यादीं स्तत्तद्ग्रन्थान्तरस्थितान् ॥
इदं विद्यापरिज्ञानात् स्वीकुर्वन्तु कृपालवः ।
तत्कृपालब्धविज्ञानादेतद्ग्रन्थो हि मत्कृतः ॥

From the above verses we learn that the author of the work, Puruṣottama, belongs to the Kauṇḍinya Gotra and that he was a protege of King Kumārayāca, Raja of Veṅkaṭagiri. The author acknowledges that the work is only a compilation of the earlier writings and that he composed the work at the instance of his patron. Neither the names of his parents nor that of his teacher are given. The author seems to hail from the Telugu country. Concerning the date of the author, it seems to be determinable with any measure of certainty only after his patron, King Kumārayācha, is identified.

The contents of the work are given on the fly-leaves which are not numbered. We give below a brief description of its contents :—

१. ब्रह्मविद्या पु. १—३३
२. ब्रह्माण्डप्रपञ्चविवेचनम् पु. ३३—४९
३. भूतभविष्यद्वर्तमानपरिज्ञानविद्या ज्योतिश्शास्त्रम् पु. ४९—२६५
In this sec. 6 pages from 155-160 are left blank.
४. सृष्ट्यादिपृथिवीपालकचक्रवर्तिसार्वभौमदेवाधिपत्यचारित्रपरिज्ञानम् पु. २६६–३२२

५. भागवतद्वादशस्कन्धकथा संग्रहरूपभगवल्लीलापरिज्ञानविद्या पु. ३२२
In this sec. only the topic is mentioned and the whole subject-matter is missing.

भगवल्लीलापरिज्ञानविद्या मातृकायां नोपलब्धा पु. ३२२

६. प्रसिद्धपुरुषचारित्रविवेचनम् पु. ३२३—३५५
In this section, some 5 pages in the beginning and 2 pages at the end are missing.

७. युक्तायुक्तपरिज्ञानसाधनदार्ष्टान्तिकनीतिवाक्यसंग्रहज्ञानम् पु. ३५५—३८६

८. उपमात्युपमानुमेयक्रमाद्यभिवर्णनालंकारविद्या पु. ३८६—३८९

९. सामुद्रिकशास्त्रम् पु. ३८९—४०४

१०. स्त्रीपुरुषलक्षणकलाशास्त्रज्ञानम् पु. ४०४—४०६

११. सृष्ट्याद्यष्टकर्तृत्वप्रतिराज्याष्टांगाष्टकर्तृत्वनिर्णयविवेचनविद्या पु. ४०६—४२१

१२. युद्धशास्त्रम् पु. ४२१—४७६

१३. वैद्यशास्त्रपञ्चकम् पु. ४७६—४८४

१४. सकलव्यवहारानुकूलदशविधगणितशास्त्रम् पु. ४८४—५४३

१५. सुवर्णरजतवर्णादिद्वात्रिंशद्वर्णप्रयुक्तचित्रपटनिर्माणविद्या पु. ५४५—५५५

१६. धूमक्रियाकर्षणप्रतिबिम्बमानकृतकविद्या पु. ५५५—५५८

१७. नानाविधचित्रलिपिभाषणादिविद्या पु. ५५८—५६०

१८. नानाविधाकारपटनिर्माणविद्या पु. ५६१—५५२

१९. पाण्डुमृत्पुटपाकविशेषात् सकलविधरूपनिर्माणविद्या पु. ५६३—५६५

२०. सकललोहोत्पत्तिलक्षणविषयकरसवादज्ञानशास्त्रम् पु. ५६६—५७५

२१. सकलवृक्षवृद्धि–अन्योन्यानुसन्धानादिकृतकदोहदनामकविद्या पु. ५७५–५९३

२२. शुद्धक्रियामन्त्रप्रतिष्ठितसूत्रविशेषवियद्गमनवाहननिर्माणविद्या पु. ५९४–५९७

२३. ढमारकुहकविनोदक्रियाविद्या पु. ५९७—६००

२४. गारुडविद्या पु. ६०२

२५. गजकर्णगोकर्णविद्या पु. ३०२
The topic is incomplete and there is break after the 8th line.

२६. सर्वजन्तुनिवहस्तम्भनविद्या पु. ६०३—६०५

२७. वशीकरणक्रियासाधनविद्या पु. ६०६—६०८

२८. अदृश्यकरणीविद्या पु. ६०८—६०९

२९. अन्यप्रयोगशून्यनिरोधनादिभूतप्रेतपिशाचोच्चाटनादिविद्या पु. ६०९—६१२

३०. अग्निस्तम्भनविद्या पु. ६१४

३१. जलस्तम्भनविद्या पु. ६१४

३२. सकलवस्तुजन्तुस्मृतिविभ्रमस्तम्भनविद्या पु. ६१४

३३. अक्षानुबद्धचक्रभ्रमणकारण अक्षभ्रमणानुगुण्यसाधनधूमतन्त्रत्रिविधगमनविषयकविद्या पु. ६१५

In this section, it is stated in the transcript copy that many leaves are found missing. The topic is incomplete.

तत्र धूमतंत्रसाधनेन भूचरगमनमेकम् । द्वितीयं जलोपरि गमनमेकम् । तृतीयं खेचरगमनमेकम् ।

३४. तन्तुसंज्ञालक्षणम् पु. ६१७

Under this topic some leaves are missing and there are many gaps.

३५. नानाविधदर्पणक्रियालक्षणम् पु. ६१७—६२८

Three leaves are missing and there are numerous gaps.

३६. धनाञ्जनादिदशविधाञ्जनज्ञाननैपुण्यविद्या पु. ६२८—६३४

३७. विचित्रगमनव्यापारविद्या पु. ६३५—६३६

३८. अश्वहृदयनामकम् पु. ६३७—६३८

३९. सकलतिर्यग्हृदयज्ञाननामकम् पु. ६३९—६४०

४०. नाविकायन्त्रविषयकनैपुण्यम् पु. ६४०—६४६

४१. गानविद्या पु. ६४७—६५१

४२. नानाविधद्यूतक्रीडानैपुण्यविद्या पु. ६५१—६६२

४३. समयोचितज्ञानविद्या दार्ष्टान्तिकादयः

४४. सूक्ष्मग्राहकसाहसनैपुण्यविज्ञानविद्या

४५. सुबोधविषयकप्रज्ञाविचक्षणसामर्थ्यज्ञानविद्या

४६. तत्कालसंघटितकार्यनिर्वहणोपायसाधनविद्या

Nothing is known about the four topics dealt with. The Ms. breaks off from the beginning to the end of these four topics. On p. 662 of the transcript it is stated—

इत आरभ्य मातृकायां अनेकानि पत्राणि चूर्णितानि ।

४७. अविचार्यमाणकृत्ये संभावनार्होपाधिज्ञानविद्या पु. ६६२—६६४

४८. सङ्केतार्थद्योतकसंख्यानुगण्यकवाक्यनैपुण्यविद्या........

The Ms. breaks off after this.

४९. न्यायान्यायविवेचनभावग्रहणसाधनविद्या........

५०. समयप्रवर्तनदर्शनचेष्टाद्यन्तरङ्गज्ञानसाधनदार्ष्टान्तिकविषयाविद्या पु. ६६७–६७१

५१ — ?

५२. अनुकूलप्रतिकूलप्रयोजनज्ञानविद्या पु. ६७२—६७७

५३. न्यायान्यायनिर्णयनैपुण्यविद्या पु. ६७७—६८१

५४. लौकिकविद्या पु. ६८१—६९२

Here also the Ms. breaks off in the middle of the topic.

(५५–६१) These sections are missing.

६२. वक्तावाङ्नैपुण्यविद्यात्रिविधनामकम् पु. ६९३—३९५

६३. अष्टादश उपक्रियाकलापकरविद्या पु. ६९५—६९६

(a) नानाविधपुष्पसुगन्धद्रव्यशीतलद्रवग्रहणविषयम् ।

(b) नानाविधदारुसत्वसंग्रहणविषयम् ।

(c) नानाविधबीजतैलग्रहणविषयम् ।

(d) नानाविधशिलास्वत्वतैजोद्रवग्रहणविषयम् ।

(e) नानाविधपटातपत्रनिर्माणम् ।

(f) नानाविधवस्तुनिर्माणकम् ।

(g) नानाविधतन्तुवायकविद्या ।

(h) नानाविधचर्मक्रियाविद्या ।

(i) नानाविधबु...........करालिककर्मकम्........

Here the Ms. ends and the remaining portions are missing in the original.

From the foregoing description of the contents, it will be seen that the work is most useful for men of various activities. The Arts are called *Kalā* in Hindu works and usually reckoned at 64. The sixty-four *Kalās* or *Vidyās* are differently enumerated by different authors, In *Śukranīti*, a distinction is drawn between *Vidyā* and *Kalā*. *Vidyā*, according to *Śukranīti*, is that which can be said and

Kalā is that which can be done even by the dumb.[1] Una... *alā*, the *Śukranīti* enumerates sixty-four Arts.[2] Vātsyāyana in his *Kāma-sūtra* gives a list of sixty-four Arts which are appropriate for young ladies. They are called *yogas* and young ladies are recommended to practise them alone in the company of their tutors, fellow students etc.[3] The list of sixty-four Arts as given by Śrīdhara Swamin in his commentary on *Bhāgavata Purāṇa*[4] closely follows that of Vātsyāyana. Śrīdhara makes Balarāma and Śrī Kṛṣṇa learn these accomplishments from their tutor Sāndīpani, but many of the accomplishments, such as *keśaśekharāpīḍa-yoga* (making of ornaments of flowers for the head), *citra-śākāpūpa-bhakṣa vikāra* (ornamental cookery), *Sūcī-karma* (Sewing) etc. for instance, are obviously feminine, and would ill-suit a man even in his youth. Vātsyāyana is, therefore, right in assigning them to young ladies. It might be said that these are the sixty-four arts, and some of them are for men, and others for women.

Bhāskararāya, in his *Saubhāgyabhāskara,* observes thus. "The 64 Kalās are differently enumerated in the *Śārṅgadharīya,* Śrīdhara's *Kathākośa* and in the *Lakṣmī Pīṭhikā* and examining them carefully, they are set forth as follows:—

चतुष्षष्टिकलाः शार्ङ्गधरीये कथाकोशे च श्रीधरीये लक्ष्मीपीठिकायां च वैलक्षण्येन गणितास्ता निष्कृष्य लिख्यन्ते—" अष्टादशलिपिबोधस्तल्लेखनशीघ्रवाचने चित्रम् । बहुविधभाषाज्ञानं तत्कविता श्रुतनिगदिताद्यूतम् ॥ वेदा उपवेदाश्चत्वारः शास्त्राङ्गषट्के द्वे । तन्त्रपुराणस्मृतिकं काव्यालङ्कारनाटकादि द्वे ॥ शान्तिर्वश्याकर्षणविद्वेषोच्चाटनमारणानि च षट् ॥ गतिजलवृष्ट्याग्न्यायुधवाग्रेतःस्तम्भसप्तकं शिल्पम् । गजहयरथनरशिक्षाः सामुद्रिकमल्लसूदगारुडकाः । तत्तत्सुषिरानद्धघनेन्द्रजालनृत्तानि गीतरसवादौ ॥ रत्नपरीक्षा चौर्यं धातुपरीक्षाप्यदृश्यत्वम् इति । भास्करसुधियोक्ता निष्कृष्य कलाश्चतुःषष्टि''रिति तत्प्रचुरा[5] ॥

In Pāli literature also, we come across a list of 64 Arts[6] (viz. carpentry, cookery architecture, jewelry medicine, acting, dancing, music, poetry, rhetoric, grammer, prosody, astronomy etc.) They are

1. यद्यत्स्यात् वाचिकं सम्यक् कर्म बिद्याभिसंज्ञकम् ।
   शक्तो मूकोऽपि यत् कर्तुं कलासंज्ञं तु तत् स्मृतम् ॥ *Śukranīti* IVth ch., sec. 3, sl. 24
   This distinction between *Vidyā* and *Kalā* is the same as that between Science and Art.
2. *Sukraniti.* ch. IV; sec. 3, 67—99. Jivānanda edn.
3. *Kāma-sūtra*, I, ii.
4. *Śrīmad-bhāgavata.* X, 45th ch. 31, Śrīdhara's commentary.
5. Commentary on *Lalitāsahasranāma* by Bhāskararāya p. 72. (Nirnaya-sagar Ed.)
6. The Attaragalu-vansa. p. 114. Ed. by D'Alvis, Colombo, 1866.

called *Kalā* in Buddhistic works. The list as given in Buddhistic works is somewhat different from what we find in Hindu works. After going through the sixty-four *Kalās* or *Vidyās* one can hardly believe that the Hindus were a race of abstract metaphysicians who were negligent of the actual needs of life and society and cultivated the art of preparing for the next life only. One would rather think that they know how to enjoy life and supply its necessaries, comforts and decencies. Economically speaking, they were as self-sufficient as any people could possibly be, and made their material and secular life as comfortable and happy as possible. Intellectually speaking, they were competent enough to investigate not only the highest truths of the universe—the eternal problems of existence, but also to study and discuss all those branches of learning which had for their aim the amelioration of human life.

The more one studies the achievements of the Hindus in exact sciences, arts and secular facts, the more one is impressed with the fact that their culture is well-known for its extraordinary range of topics—the splendid variety of subjects—the extension of its working in various spheres of thought. And their institutions—economic, political. industrial, educational and administrative—were adequate for all the ends of human existence. If they differ from anything of the kind in modern times or in other countries, it is because of the adaptations to the circumstances and conditions of time and place which is the fundamental cause of all varieties and differences in the universe. The truth rather is, in all these aspects of secular arts and sciences they represent a distinct type which is not necessarily low, mediaeval or primitive simply because it does not resemble the types that are predominant today. The work under notice will give the reader a comprehensive view of all intellectual labours of the past.

N. Subrahmanya Sastri.

III

BALABHAGAVATHAM

No. 7120.

The manuscript under notice, bearing No. 7120, is one of the numerous rare collections deposited in the S. V. Oriental Institue. It is a paper transcript of a Telugu manuscript (Prabandha) of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library bearing the number D 27. The author of the work is Śrī Donūri Konerunātha Kavi.

From the title '*Bāla Bhāgavatam*' it appears that the work is an abridged form of the Sanskrit *Bhāgavatam.* The subject-matter of the twelve skandhas of the original Sanskrit Purāṇa is condensed into six āsvāsas and is rendered in an attractive way into a Prabandha, befitting the literary taste of the period. This manuscript consists of five āśvāsas and a part of the sixth and covers the subject-matter to the end of the 10th skandha of the original and a major portion of the 11th skandha. A few verses (about four or five) in the beginning and the later portion of the sixth āśvāsa are wanting in the manuscript. There are further many omissions here and there and the manuscript is full of mistakes.

The work is of some literary and historical value, and is written in the Prabandha style. From an examination of the text, it is clearly seen that the author has closely followed the path of Potana in adhering to the original Sanskrit Purāṇa although there are some slight differences in the names of Riṣis and mountains. *e.g.*, హిరణ్యరోమ for హిరణ్యరేత ; పారిభద్ర for పారిబర్హ etc.

In the introductory portion of the text, the author describes himself thus :—

"సీ॥ శ్రీమదహోబల శ్రీనృసింహ సమగ్ర కరుణా విశేషప్రకాశ మహితు
భాసుర సంస్కృత ప్రాకృతాదిక శాస్త్ర భాషా కవిత్వ సౌభాగ్యనిపుణు
జనవర్ణితాశ్వలాయన సూత్రపావన శ్రీవత్సగోత్రాబ్ధి శిశిరకరుని
సారస్యవినుతు దోనూరి నాగయమంత్రి పుత్రుండనైనట్టి పుణ్యచరితు,

తే-గీ॥ జతురభూనాయకాస్థాన సకల సుజన । వందితుని నన్నుగోనేరునాథ సుకవి
నర్థిఁబిలిపించి సత్కారమాచరించి । పలికె నిట్లని గంభీర భాషణముల॥"

From the above verses we learn that he was a devotee of Narasimha, and that he was a great scholar in Sanskrit, Prakrit etc., and a poet of great fame and that he was patronised by Tirumalarāja. We also see that he is the son of Donūri Nāgayamantri of Aśvalāyaṇa sūtra and of Śrīvatsa gotra. The author says that he was requested by his patron Tirumalarāja, son of Timmarāja, who is known as Rāmarāju Timmarāju of the Āravīdu dynasty, to write the *Bāla Bhāgavatam* and to dedicate the work to his father. The following verse relates the same fact.

"కం॥ ఈకృతికి భర్త రామ
క్ష్మాకాంతుని తిమ్మనృపతిగా నిట్టి విధం
బాకర్ణింపఁగ తిరుమల
భూకాంతుఁడు కర్తగాఁగఁ బూనితిఁ బలుకన్॥"

Bāla Bhāgavatam, being received by the public with high esteem for its diction and theme, Tirumalarāja requested his court poet Konerunātha to write another work with the same theme in Dvipada metre and had it dedicated to his younger brother Chinna Timmarāja. The above fact is known from the introductory portion of the Dvipada *Bāla Bhāgavatam* of the same author which runs thus.

"వచియించి తౌననఁ బద్యకావ్యముగఁ
ప్రచురంబుగా బాల భాగవతంబు
వాసికినెక్కి యివ్వసుధాతలమున
భాసిల్లు నా బాల భాగవతంబె
యరుదుగా నడిచిన యన్ని మార్గములఁ
దిరముగా మా చిన తిమ్మయ్య పేర
ద్విపదకావ్యంబుగా వెలయంగఁజేయు
మిపుడు మాకెంతయు హితమిది యనుచు॥"

In the concluding portion of this Dvipada Kāvya it is stated that the work has been written in the year 1469 of the Sālivāhanaśaka, which corresponds to 1547 A.D.

"చం॥ అరుదుగ శాలివాహన శకాబ్దములెన్న నిధాన, తర్క, సా
గర, శశి సంఖ్యచే వెలయుఁగల్గు ప్లవంగమనంగ మించు వ
త్సరమునఁబల్కెఁ దిమ్మవసుధాపతికిన్ గవిసార్వభౌముఁడీ
హరిహిత బాలభాగవతహారి పదద్విపద ప్రబంధమున్॥"

As the Dvipada *Bhāgavatam* is a later work of the author, the date of the Prabandha under notice, i.e. *Bāla Bhāgavatam* can be safely fixed at about 1540 A.D.

The author has furnished the genealogy of the Aravidu dynasty to some extent, which is of great historical value as stated by Sri N. Venkataramanayya, M.A., Ph.D., in his article on Aravidu dynasty (అరవీటివంశ చరిత్ర) in the Telugu Journal *Bhārati*

(Vol. VI pages 945-867). A table showing the genealogy of the family is also given there. From a reference to the above article the *Bhārati* (L.R. Vol. 33 p. 244 in the page 867 at the foot note) it is learnt that a village has been granted to the author of *Bāla Bhāgavatam*, Śrī Donūri Konerunātha. The record runs thus:

"ఈ గ్రామానకు (కమలాపురం, తా॥ కోడూరునకు) యీశాన్యం, పఘు పరువు దూరమున యర్రగుంట్ల అనే గ్రామం దోనూరి కోనయ్యగారికి యీ నంద్యాల నారశింహరాజుగారే ధారాగ్రహీతంగా యిచ్చిరి. యిందుకు దాఖలా యీ యర్రగుంట్ల గ్రామంయొక్క పొలిమేర చెతుర్దిక్కులయందు వలయ వామన ముద్రలు రాతిపైనచెక్కి దిగువ దోనూరి కోనయ్యగారి అగ్రహారం యెర్రగుంట్ల అని ఆ పొలిమేర రెండు యేగ్రామం కలుస్తూవున్నదో ఆ గ్రామం పేరున్ను వ్రాసినారు. యీ దోనూరి కోనయ్య అనే బ్రాంహ్మడే బాలభాగవతం అనే ప్రాకృత గ్రంథం చేసినాడు. అందులో ఆరవేటి బుక్కరాయల ప్రకరణంలో తద్వంశీకులయిన నంద్యాల రాజుల వంశావళివున్నది."

(L. R. Vol. 33. p. 244)

Kandukuri Veeresalingam Pantulu has mentioned about the author and the work in his *Lives of Telugu Poets*, Part II but the work has not seen the light till now. In the Andhravaṅmaya sañchika, containing the list of printed books, the work *Bāla Bhāgavatam* (Dvipada) of our author is said to have been printed in 1914. But no mention is made about our manuscript under notice. It is deplorable that the work has been ignored all the time although it is an excellent work of literary merit with a charming style. A few verses are quoted here to serve as an illustration of his style.

"ఉ॥ బొంకని ధర్మజుండడుగంబోవని పన్నగశాయి యాజిలో
గొంకని యర్జునుండు, కరకుండులులేని శశాంకుఁడెన్నఁడున్
గ్రుంకని భానుఁడన్యసతిఁగోరని జిష్ణుఁడనంగఁబొల్చు ధ
ర్మాంకుఁడు విఠ్ఠల క్షితివరాగ్రణి మానధనాగ్రగణ్యుఁడై॥"

"సీ॥ కటకాఖ్య కటకస్థ కరటిరాడ్ఘటా సంభూత మదభర స్తంభకంబు।
పాండ్యభూమీభృత్సభా సభాజిత భటోద్భట భుజాబలగర్వ భంజకంబు।
ముఖ్యా మహాదుర్గ తుఖ్కారపతి వపుస్థాయి వేపథు సముత్థానదంబు।
ఢిల్లీపురాధీశ పల్లవోష్ఠీ భావి విప్రలంభ కథా భయప్రదంబు।

తే-గీ॥ రామ నరనాథ తిమ్మ భూరమణపుత్ర। విఠ్ఠలేశాభిధాన పృథ్వీకళత్ర।
ధాటికారంభ సంభ్రమద్ధ్వనిత పటహ। గణ సముత్థిత ధణధణం ధణరవంబు॥ ”

“శా॥ గబ్బుల్ డెబ్బదివేవురాశ్వికులు వేడ్కం గొల్వఁగాఁ గిన్కఁ బె
న్నబ్బుల్ గప్పఁగ గందనోలు గొనుఁ ప్రే-మన్ జుట్టుముట్టన్ సదా
బిబ్బీనుబ్బణఁగించి తోలె నరిరా-డ్భీముండు లంకా సర
ణ్యబ్బంధ్యాభుఁడు బుక్కభూవరుని రా-మాధీశుఁడాహోయనన్॥ ”

“ఉ॥ సారత రత్రయీపథము-సాంఖ్యముపాశుపతంబు వైష్ణవా
చారము నాదిగా గలుగు-సన్మతముల్ వివరించి చూచినన్
సారథిఁ జేరు వాహినుల-వైఖరి నెవ్వనిజేరియుండు నా
కారుణికోత్తమున్ వరదుఁ గైకొని నే శరణంబు వేఁడెదన్॥ ”

“మ॥ మృగనాభిం దపనీయవర్ణ గరిమోన్మేషంబు, హేమంబునన్
బ్రగుణామోద విశేష, మిక్షువున సారశ్రీఫలోద్భూతి, చె
న్నగు గంధప్రచుర ప్రసూనతతియందమ్లాన భావంబులై
తగు, మెచ్చంగ మనీషికిన్ హరిపదధ్యానాదరం బబ్బినన్॥ ”

“చం॥ బలవద పుణ్యశైల పవి,-పాతక వారిధి కుంభసూతి, సం
కుల కలుషాహితార్క్ష్యమును,-ఘోరతరాఘ దవాగ్ని సంవళ
త్కలుష మదావళేంద్ర హరి-కల్మషమేఘ మహా సమీర మం
కిలిపడకుండఁ జేయు హరి-కీర్తన మెత్తఁటి నెల్లవారికిన్॥ ”

“ఉ॥ అంచితయుక్తి భూమి భర-మారసి డించుటకేము నిన్ను బ్రా
ర్థించితి మాదికాలమున దేవ యదూద్వహ లీలనిట్లు వ
ర్తించి ప్రతిశ్రుతార్థము విధించితి, దైవకార్యవృత్తి శే
షించుటలేదు నీమనుజ చిహ్నము లేమిటికింక నచ్యుతా॥ ”

This work has been undertaken to be edited in this Institute and the members of the Institute will be obliged to the Telugu public if they furnish information about the remaining protion of the text or any manuscript copies of the work so that the work may be edited completely and brought to light as early as possible for the benefit of the Telugu knowing public.

IV

ALAṄKĀRASAṄGRAHA

No. 6280

This is one of the various rare manuscripts of this Institute. It comprises a complete treatise on Rhetoric in Sanskrit by Amṛtānanda Yogi. This manuscript is received from Sri M. Ramakrishna Kavi, M A., Reader in Telugu in this Institute. Similar manuscripts are in other libraries also but still the work has not seen the light so far. The manuscript bearing No. 12794 of the Government Manuscripts Library with the title '*Alaṅkāra Saṅgraha*' by Amṛtānanda Yogi is said to contain only five chapters and that with No. R. 2186, is said to contain four chapters only. The five chapters of the former and the four of the latter put together correspond to the first nine chapters of the manuscript under notice. Another manuscript bearing No. R. 2126(b) has been described as being complete, but no mention is made of the contents and the number of chapters contained in it. Another manuscript of the Gautamī Library of Rajahmundry is said to contain nine chapters. Our manuscript bearing No. 6280 of the S. V. O. Institute contains eleven chapters.

The manuscript under notice contains the following chapters:

१. वर्णगणविचारः	७. सन्ध्यङ्गनिरूपणम्
२. शब्दार्थनिर्णयः	८. वृत्तिनिरूपणम्
३. रसनिर्णयः	९. रूपकनिरूपणम्
४. नेतृभेदविचारः	१०. नाट्यालंकारनिरूपणम्
५. अलंकारनिर्णयः	११. चाटुप्रबन्धलक्षणम्
६. दोषनिर्णयः	

The work appears to be wanting in a chapter as the varieties and definitions of the *guṇas* have not been dealt with in the above-named eleven chapters.

From the introductory verses it is known that this work has been written by Śrī Amṛtānanda Yogi at the instance of Manva Bhūpa well-known as Tyāgamahasamudra, son of Bhakti Bhūpa, a devotee of Śiva. It is mentioned that the king requested the poet to compose a complete work comprising all the topics of Alaṅkāra Śāstra for the benefit of scholars. The poet Amṛtānanda Yogi acknowledges his indebtedness to the writings of ancient authors from which he has collected information for the purpose of making his work complete in

all respects i.e., *Sarvālaṅkāra Saṅgraha*, as stated by him in the following lines.

स कदाचित्सभामध्ये काव्यालापकथान्तरे ।
अपृच्छदमृतानन्दमादरेण कवीश्वरम् ॥

वर्णशुद्धिं काव्यवृत्तिं रसान् भावाननन्तरम् ।
नेतृभेदानलंकारान् दोषानपि च तद्गुणान् ॥

नाट्यधर्मान् रूपकोपरूपकाणां भिदा अपि ।
चाटुप्रबन्धभेदांश्च विक्षिप्तांस्तत्र तत्र तु ॥

संचित्यैकत्र कथय सौकर्याय सतामपि ।
मया तत्प्रार्थितेनेत्थममृतानन्दयोगिना ॥

तन्त्रान्तरोदितानर्थान् वाक्यान्येव क्वचित्क्वचित् ।
संचिंत्य क्रियते सम्यक् सर्वालंकार संग्रहः ॥

It deals with many aspects of Rhetoric collected from various sources. The author quotes verses from numerous texts, mostly adhering to the standard works in Alaṅkāra Sāstra such as *Kāvyādarśa, Kāvyaprakāśa* and *Daśarūpaka* etc. He deals in this treatise with rhetoric, poetics, dramaturgy and literary criticism. Following Daṇḍin he gives 36 Alaṅkāras and adds 8 Pramāṇa Alaṅkāras, i.e , प्रत्यक्षानुमानशब्दोपमानार्थापत्त्यभावसंभवैतिह्याः ॥

He gives illustrations from different texts which exhibit his vast study and profound knowledge. M. Krishnamachariar, M.A., M.L., Ph.D. in his *Classical Sanskrit Literature* says that the author quotes from the following rare works viz , *Marīcavañcana, Vālivadha, Udāttarāghava, Nalavijaya* and *Devīpariṇaya.*

As for the date of the work, M. Krishnamachariar states that king Manva Bhūpa son of Bhakti Bhūpati probably lived about 1250 A.D. Amṛtānanda Yogi, being a contemporary of the King, may also be assigned to the same period. Gauranārya the author of *Lakṣaṇadīpikā* which is otherwise known as *Prabandhadīpikā*, a rhetorical work in Sanskrit, quotes *Alaṅkārasaṅgraha.* Gaurana is said to be the son of Ayyalamantri, brother of Bommera Potana, author of Telugu *Bhāgavatam*, who lived about 1400 A.D. So Amṛtānanda Yogi must have flourished before him. The name of one Manva Bhūpa is found in one of the inscriptions in Nuzvid Taluk in Krishna District of about the 13th century A.D. It

is doubtful whether this Manva is identical with the Manva of our *Alaṅkâra Saṅgraha*.

There are two Amṛtānandanāthas, one the author of the commentary *Yoginīhṛdayadīpa* on *Yoginīhṛdaya* a tantric text, and the other, the author of *Ṣaṭtriṁśattatvasandoha* a philosophical work. Neither of these has mentioned about this *Alaṅkāra Saṅgraha*, or about the king Manva Bhūpa for identity. Hence our Amṛtānanda Yogi is different from them.

It appears that the author Amṛtānanda Yogi might have been an Andhra or Karnāṭaka. At the end of each chapter a verse is found praising the dedicatee Manva Bhūpa. This practice is mostly observed by poets of Andhra and Karnāṭaka in their kāvyas.

Alaṅkāra Saṅgraha by Amṛtananda Yogi is now being edited and translated into Telugu in this Institute. It is requested that Sanskrit scholars and sympathisers of Sanskrit language might help us by furnishing information about the copies of the work and thus help us in bringing it to light.

P. BALAKRISHNA MURTI.

---

1. A copy of Alaṅkārasaṅgraha with 5 chapters is said to have been edited and translated into English and published by the Bharati Mitra Press, Calcutta 1887.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES

I

Is Vyāsa the same as Bādarāyaṇa?

For the past about seven centuries Vēda Vyāsa and Bādarāyaṇa were regarded to be the same individual under different names by Sanskrit scholars like Mallinātha and Veṅkaṭādhvarin and Andhra writers as Tikkana and Srīnātha. But on the following 14 grounds I venture to bring to the notice of the world that they were neither identical nor of the same age.

1. The *Mahābhārata* was written by Vyāsa and his disciples. On about 70 occasions in that epic his name found a mention wherein he was referred to as Vyāsa, Dvaipāyana, Kṛṣṇa-dvaipāyana, Sātyavratēya Pārāśarya but never for once as Bādarāyaṇa.

2. Some derive the word Bādarāyaṇa from 'Badari' a tree which abounded in 'Badarivana' meaning thereby as 'one living in that forest.' The word Dvaipāyana means one who lives in an island. Badarivana is on the banks of the Ganges, whereas the island, Vyāsa's birth-place, is in the Jumna. So, how can the two localities be considered the same?

3. Nannaya, the foremost Andhra poet and grammarian, refers to Vyāsa in 13 places in that part of the *Mahābhārata* written by him. But nowhere is found the mention of the word Bādarāyaṇa.

4. Kshēmendra, a famous poet of Kashmir was a contemporary of Nannaya. He was the writer of 23 works of merit. In his *Bhāratamañjarī* he writes that Vyāsa appeared to him in a dream and blessed him and said "You will expound the truth of my *Mahābhārata*," in obedience to which he wrote *Bhāratamañjarī* of 8800 slokas. He wrote Vyāsāṣṭaka and his extreme devotion for him made him call himself 'Vyāsadāsa.' In 30 places of *Bhāratamañjarī* there is a reference to Vyāsa but not even once as Bādarāyaṇa.

5. Being the *Vēdavibhāgakartā* Vyāsa, throughout the *Mahābhārata* is found sermonising on the importance of *Karma* or action and the fruit thereof. Jaimini-maharṣi, his disciple, closely following his master's foot-steps wrote the *Pūrvamīmāmsā* which advocates *Karma*. Some pandits believe that it inculcates 'Atheism.' A few may say 'Does not the *Bhagavadgītā* a part of the *Mahābhārata* teach Brahmajñāna?' But Lokamānya Tilak, one of the eminent thinkers, avers that it teaches Karmayoga. Vidyāśēkhara Pandit Akkirāju

Umākāntam contributed certain articles to the monthly *Andhra Vāṅgmaya* to the effect that Vyāsa's teachings were more for Artha and Kāma, i.e., wealth and want, than for Dharma and Mokṣa i.e., duty and salvation.

6. In his Śārīraka-Bhāṣya (commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras*) His Holiness Śrī Saṅkara-Bhagavatpādācharya cited several authorities from the *Bhārata* and *Bhagavadgītā* in support of the views of Bādarāyaṇa as he was considered by him to be different from Vyāsa. If they were one and the same, Śrī Śaṅkara would never have committed the error of quoting his writing in his own support. So, even in Śaṅkara's opinion Vyāsa and Bādarāyaṇa were two different individuals.

7. Lokamānya Tilak, author of the *Gītārahasya* wrote that he was of the same opinion and that subsequent writers might have considered him as almost identical with Vyāsa as he might have supplied certain portions of the *Mahābhārata* that might have been found wanting by his time. The late lamented Śrī Purāṇapaṇḍā Mallayya Śāstrī also was of the same opinion as is evidenced by the foreword to his translation of the *Brahmasūtra-Bhāṣya* into Telugu.

8. Śrī Śītānātha Tattvabhūshan, the famous writer in English of *Kriṣṇa-gītā, Kriṣṇa-Purāṇa, Śāstrīya-Brahmavāda* explicitly asserted in his translation of the *Brahma-sūtra Bhāṣya* in English the same fact.

9. Śrī Saprey in his *Bhārata-Mīmāmsa* wrote that Bādarāyaṇa lived in the III century B. C. It must have been so as is apparent from his denunciation of Bauddha and Jaina principles that originated about the V century B. C. and were gaining ground gradually.

10. One other fact confirmed me more in my conviction. Vyāsa had five disciples: Sumanta, Jaimini, Paila, Śuka, and Vaiśampāyana. Bādarāyaṇa in his sūtra *Dharmam Jāiminir ata yeva* considers Jaimini's principles as long prior to his *sūtras*. If Bādarāyaṇa was Vyāsa it could never be imagined that he would have referred to them as long prior to his. Hence Bādarāyaṇa can never be the same as Vyāsa (Kriṣṇa-dvaipāyana), the teacher of Jaimini and his mates, nor even his contemporary.

11. When I with a full knowledge of the above facts finished my *History of the Mahābhārata* agreeing with them, I happened to come by, while studying Pāṇini's grammar for a certain purpose, the several lists of words regarding the formation of whose derivatives, the rule '*Naḍādibhyaḥ phak*' (4-1-99) in that group which indicated '*gōtrā-patyavidhi*,' teaches how to form the words indicating the genealogical descent from a single root. In the list beginning with 'naḍa' is included the word 'Baḍara.' The rule lays down that the first syllable

is to be elongated adding 'ayana' to the last. Then the words will read as Nāḍāyana, Sākaṭāyana, Jālandharāyaṇa, Bādarāyāṇa etc. Now their meaning has to be ascertained. It is apparent that they must be next in descent or by two or more removes from their orgin. Not resting with the above Pāṇini laid down another rule '*Ata Iñ*' to differentiate subsequent descent, in consequence of which the first descent transforms 'naḍa' as 'nāḍi' and 'Badara' as 'Bādari.'

12. Bādarāyaṇa in his *Brahmasūtras* mentioned the views of 'Bādari' his father or grandfather. For the above reasons Bādarāyaṇa was conclusively either the grandson or the greatgrandon of 'Badara,' his son being Bādari. Vyāsa is the son of Parāśara whose father was Śakti-maharṣi who was the son of Vasiṣṭha. The above facts set at rest beyond any doubt the controversy respecting the identity of Bādarāyaṇa and Vyāsa who are two different individuals, of two different ages.

13. I was for sometine doubting whether the word 'Badara' was not wrongly included in Naḍādi list of 60 words. But after a time it so chanced that I had a look into the *Gaṇaratna-mahōdadhi* the work of Śrī Vardhamāna Paṇḍita of the XII century A.D. My doubt was dispelled by finding the word 'Badara' in his 'Naḍādi' list. He wrote that his work was composed after consulting *eight* grammarians.

14. The *Veda* is more authoritative to us than even grammar. Now are extant nine *Sāmavēda Brāhmaṇas* of which *Tāṇḍya* is the biggest. *Vaṁśa-Brāhmaṇa*, a portion of the *Tāṇḍya* gives as hereunder a list of teachers of *Sāmavēda* in their order :

Prajāpati
|
Bṛhaspati
|
Nārada
|
Viṣvaksēna
|
Pārāśaryavyāsa
|
Jaimini
|
Pāriayindya
|
Poushindyāyana
|
Bādarāyaṇa
|
Tāṇḍi and Śāṭyāyana

who in their turn taught it to several others. From the above it is evident that Vyāsa is five generations and Jaimini four above

Bādarāyaṇa. There is one Bādarāyaṇi the son of Bādarāyaṇa in the list of teachers in order of *Atharva Veda.*

These 14 grounds give a quietus to the aforesaid controversy. Now the question why and from when Bādarāyaṇa was regarded as Vyāsa remains :—

Mahāvīra the XXIV Tīrthaṅkara of Jain religion, introduced certain changes in the principles then prevailing in the V century B. C. Later they were attempted to be enforced by Khāravela, the king of Kaliṅga. But as Nāgārjuna and Gautamīputraśātakarṇi for the spread of the Mahāyāna principles, and Kaniṣka and other kings of the Kushan House in the North for the spread of the Hīnayāna principles of the Buddhistic religion, did their best the Jain religion began to decline in the II century A. D. But in II A.D. the Western Chālukyas whose capital was Kalyāṇapura adopted the Jain religion and worked for its expansion. Their Jainism included the principles of Pārśvanātha the XXIII Tīrthaṅkara of the Jain religion. The most prominent of the Chālukya rulers between XI and XII centuries was Vikramāditya VI. He reigned over a large part of the present Bombay Presidency, subdued the modern Madras Presidency and Nizam Dominions and had spread Jain religion.

But that religion had many draw-backs, which to counter-act and put down Vīraśiva, Viśiṣṭādvaita and Madhva sects did their utmost. That is why much less denunciation of Jaina principles is found in *Śaṅkara-Bhāṣya* than in those of *Rāmānuja* and *Madhva-Bhāṣyas* to the Brahma-Sūtras and in the *Gīta-Bhāṣya* also.

(Vide *Śrī Bhāṣya* and *Madhva-Bhāṣya* relating to '*Ekasminnasambhavādhikaraṇa* (Jaināddhikaraṇa). Only when Jain religion was at its zenith great Telugu poets like Tikkana worshipped Pārśvanātha, said to combine the qualities of Siva and Keśava, as Hariharanātha. Like the Jains, Vīraśaiva also not recognising the supreme authority of the *Vedas*, condemned the *Brahma Sūtras* which treated their professions very lightly. They were audacious enough to imagine and aver that the *Vēdavibhāgakartā* and the author of the *Brahma Sūtras* were one and the same as Vyāsa Bādarāyaṇa. Many ancient works are published now and this is the age of research. Truth will be out in time.

Mere cramming never helps a man. An intelligent critical study of the concerned works will bring them into lime-light dispelling all haziness and discovering them as two different individuals living in two different ages.

P. V. SUBRAMANYA SASTRY,

II

Āṇṭu and Etirāṇṭu in Inscriptions.

Instead of giving a certain figure, it is a poetical method to give it as the sum of two or three figures: *Kollam tollāyirattōṭirupatumirupattārumevañch pattum chērnnīṭunnōru kāle.* "The year of Quilon, which is 900+20+26+10." We find this method in a large number of poems, and in inscriptions. Mr. S. Subrahmanya Sastry, B.A., has advanced a position in this Journal to the effect that the *etirāṇṭu* found in inscriptions denotes a break in the reign of that king—he was deprived of his throne by an enemy.

This theory is quite untenable.

1. If *āṇṭu* 2 and *etirāṇṭu* 9 are given in the inscription of a king, we must conclude, according to Mr. Sastry, that the king was driven away from his throne in his ninth year. Suppose he regained the throne after five years; then in the eleventh (2+9) year after his coronation he was out of his throne.

2. Is it reasonable to suppose that the kings would be very particular about commemorating their shame—their defeat?

3. In the following seventeen inscriptions the year 2 is given with *etirāṇṭu*.

2+14	Rājasimhavarman (Śastry, p. 12)		
2+4	Parkara Iravi	(Trav. Arch. Series,	III p. 180).
2+29	,,	,, ,,	II p. 34.
2+12	,,	,, ,,	II p. 34.
2+31	,,	,, ,,	II p. 44.
2+6+35	,,	,, ,,	II p. 31.
2+11	,,	,, ,,	II p. 39.
2+36	,,	,, (Madras Journal of Literature & Science,	XIII, p. 136).
2+8	Kulaśekhara Koyilatikari	T. A. S.	V, p. 38.
2+8	Irayar	,,	VIII p. 42.
2+32	Arikesarideva	,,	I p. 278.
2+23	Parākramapantiyadeva	,,	I, No. 15, p. 254.
2+31	,,	,,	,, p. 255.
2+5	,,	,,	,, p. 257.
2+9	,,	,,	,, p. 262.
2+3	Śrivallabha	,,	,, p. 263.
2+1	Tirumelveliperumāl	,,	,, p. 264.

Why were all these kings anxious to make inscriptions exactly two years after every one of their disasters?

4. According to this theory we shall have to believe Parkara Iravi I was deprived of his throne in his 2nd, 4th, 11th, 12th, 31st, 36th and 46th years of his reign, and Parkara Iravi II was deposed in his 6th, 7th, 29th, and 35th years of his reign.

Parākramapantiyadeva, we are asked to believe, was deposed in his 5th, 9th, 23rd and 31st years. Rājarāja III, Mr. Sastry says, was deposed in his 7th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 12th, 16th, 17th, 23rd, 25th, 26th and 30th years of his reign, because these years are given in his inscriptions as *etirāṇṭu.* In short almost all kings, whose inscriptions we have, were deposed once or more than once according to this theory; we find very few inscriptions in which there is no *etirāṇṭu.*

5. The year 2 is given as *etirāṇṭu* against 41 in the inscription of Parkāra Iravi I. If 2 is the year of his dethronement, it is not likely to say 41 years after the 2nd, because he was deposed five times (4th, 11th, 12th, 31st, 36th years) within that period.

6. That this is only a poetic method of mentioning the date is evident from the Tenkāsi Pillar inscription of Arikesari, lines 50—57. *Iraṇṭāvatiṇ etir irupattiraṇṭāvatu vaikāchi mātam tuṭaṅki muppattoṉrāvatiṉ etir oṉpatāvatu vare patiṉēḻu varshattukuḷḷa tiruppaṇi cheytu niravērriṉa itu māṉushamalla daivikameṉṟu ellāvarum arintukoḷḷavum.* "Within 17 years from Vaikāchi in the year 2+22 to the year 31+9, this work was completed. Let all people know that this was not human, but divine" (T A. S. I, pp. 100, 101).

Mr. Sastry himself has given two other cases in support of this:—"As regards the regnal year of the king, the date is not only specified in Tamil in date *c*, but every detail of it is repeated in Sanskrit in date *b* with the only difference that here the year is the 25th of Rājagambiradeva, while in *c.* it is the 12th year opposite to the 13th of Kulaśekharadeva.' It, therefore, follows that where two dates are furnished in the inscriptions in relation to the regnal year of the king, as *patimmūnrāvatin etir panniraṇṭām āṇṭu i.e.*, the 12th of year opposite to the 13th year, as in this case, the period of reign has to be counted as 25 years by adding the two figures 13 and 12. This principle is also indicated in the larger Sinnamannūr plates of Rājasimhavarman, the Pāntiya king, who granted the village of... ......in the 14th opposite to the 2nd year of his reign according to the Tamil portion of the grant, which the Sanscrit portion of the grant equates with......16th regnal year" (p. 12).

Now let us examine his evidence to establish his theory. "Numerous breaks." says Mr. Sastry, "in the reign of Rājarāja III from the 7th year onwards to the 30th and last year are revealed by

a large number of his inscriptions which indicate them by furnishing the double date of the regnal years by mentioning the āṇḍu and the ediräṇḍu. They occurred for the first time during the 7th (6+1st) year of his reign, then in the 8th (7+1st) year, 9th (8+1st) year, 11th (10+1st) year, 12th (11+1st) year, 16th (15+1st) year, 17th (16+1st) year, 23rd (22+1st) year, 25th (24+1st) year, 26th (25+1st) year, and 30th (29+1st) year, so much so that at least eleven periods of interregnum during his reign of thirty years are brought to light" (pp. 19, 20).

What Mr. Sastry says here is that the break took place in the years of the inscriptions, 7th, 8th, 9th, 11th, 12th, 16th, 17th, 23rd, 25th, 26th, 30th, not in the *etirāṇṭus*, 6th, 7th, 8th, 10th, 11th, 15th, 16th, 22nd, 24th, 25th, 29th. First of all he takes the 16th year. He says that Rājarāja was deposed in his 16th year. *Etirāṇṭu* of the inscription he refers to, it must be noted, is not 16th, but 15th. The deposition, Mr. Sastry says, "happened 'in the year which was opposite to the 15th year of the Emperor'" (p. 13). The deposition, it is admitted, did not take place in the *etirāṇṭu*, 15th. Again he says:—"On the three occasions of the interregnum which, as noticed above, occurred during his 7th, 16th and 17th years"—not during the *etirāṇṭus* (p. 20). And again:—"The last interregnum in the 30th and last regnal year of Rājarāja III would appear to have been brought about by his successor Rājendra III" (p. 22).

Whether any break took place in his 7th, or 16th, or 17th, or 30th year of his reign does not concern us. It is the *etirāṇṭus* that concern us. We therefore need not examine his evidence, which he has advanced to prove the interregnum.

Even if it is proved that during one or two of these *etirāṇṭus* Rājarāja was deposed, his conclusion will not follow; because eleven years out of thirty are given as *etirāṇṭus*—it may happen by mere chance. Moreover it is quite clear from the inscriptions of Rājarāja that the *etiraṇṭus* have no significance whatever. One is the invariable figure attached to the *etirāṇṭus* in these inscriptions. In the inscriptions of Parkāra Iravi and others 2 is generally added to the *ětirāṇṭu*; in a few other inscriptions one is added to it. If all the *etirāṇṭus* of Rājarāja are taken as the years of his depositions, it must be supposed that he was very particular about commemorating his depositions invariably a year after the event—eleven times. It is therefore evident that the position advanced by Mr. Sastry is not maintainable.

K. N. DANIEL.

OBITUARY NOTICE.

PROF. P. P. SUBRAHMANIA SASTRI.

Professor P. P. S. Sastri—Palamadai Pichumani Subrahmaṇia Sastri was the full name—was born in the family of the famous Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkshita who was the Prime Minister under Tirumala Nāyak of the Nāyak dynasty of Madura. Nīlakaṇṭha Dīkshita was a great Sanskrit poet, grammarian, bhakta and philosopher and statesman all combined in one and hence Sanskrit, Religion and Philosophy ran in the veins of Prof. Sastri.

After passing the Intermediate Examination from the Hindu College, Tinnevelly Prof. Sastri joined the Presidency College, Madras and passed the Sanskrit Honours Examination. After passing the same in 1916 he became a Research student under Prof. Kuppuswami Sāstri and took Bādarāyaṇa's Philosophy as his subject of research. He so studied for a year and a half and then the Government of India awarded a scholarship to Mr. Sastri for higher study of Sanskrit on advanced and scientific lines. Mr. Sastri went to the Balliol College, Oxford and specialised in Philology and Veda under Professor A. A. Macdonell. He returned to India in 1919 and held several appointments as the Superintendent of Sanskrit Schools and District Educational Officer. He was the first Indian to be appointed as Principal of a Government College. He was then appointed as the Additional Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency College and when Prof. Kuppuswami Śāstri retired, Mr. P. P. S. Sastri succeeded him as the Professor of Sanskrit, Presidency College, Madras. The Presidency College, Madras is the only College in the Madras Presidency in which Sanskrit is taught in the Honours classes and Prof. Sastri held the place of Professor for 17 years till his death in November 1945. He was the examiner for several Universities and was a member of the Board of Studies in the Madras, Travancore, Andhra and Annamalai Universities. He took active part in the Indian Philosophical Congress and the Oriental Conference. He held the post of Professor of Sanskrit with great distinction and ability especially when he succeeded such stalwarts as Dr. Oppert, Prof. Rangachāriar and Prof. Kuppuswami Śāstrigal. The main work of a Professor lies in his classroom and it was a treat to hear Porf. Sastri explain the philosophical topics in good chaste fluent and idiomatic English. In explaining Sanskrit in English, none could excel him. Prof. Sastri's photo was unveiled in the Presidency College by Dr. Dey, Ex-Director of Public Instruction.

He edited the South Indian Recension of the *Mahābhārata* in 18 volumes and the same was published by Messrs. V. Rama-

swamy Sastrulu and Sons, Madras. Prof. Sastri has appended an introduction to each volume giving the special features of his edition and in Vols. 1 and 2 he has written a long Introduction explaining the special features of the South Indian Recension. He has there pointed out that the *Mahābhārata* had always retained 100,000 ślokas from the very beginning. What all Prof. Sastri has written in his prefaces might be collected together in a small volume entitled the Mahābhārata Studies of Prof. Sastri. It could be said truly that what Dr. Sukthankar did for the Bhandarkar Receárch Institute's Edition, Prof. Sastri did for the Southern Reeension. While editing, Prof. Sastri added the unpublished commentary of Vādiraja to the Sabhā Parvan and all succeeding scholars owe a great debt to the publication of the said commentary for the first time by Porf. Sastri. The South Indian Recension of Prof. Sastri came in for criticism at the hands of the Bhandarkar Research Institute and Prof. Sastri answered only a portion of the same and owing to his indifferent health during the last year was not able to present his answer to their criticism.

Prof. Sastri took a deep interest in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. He edited the Yuddha Kāṇḍa Part I for the Sri Vani Vilas Press of Srirangam. He edited the same with the help of several manuscripts and showed that the Vālmīki text had at one time exactly 24,000 ślokas. Part II of the Yuddha Kāṇḍa is ready for the Press. He wrote several articles on the *Rāmāyaṇa*. In one, he showed the different recensions of the *Gāyatrī Rāmāyaṇa* and in another he fixed the dates of the several commentators on the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Bhandarkar Institute's Silver Jubilee Volume). He abridged the *Rāmāyaṇa* in the poet's own words and published the same with an English translation. The translation is well commended by the Rt. Hon'ble Srinivāsa Sāstri in his Foreword and this is prescribed as a text-book in the College classes and has now reached the 4th edition.

Prof. Sastri drew the attention of the Government to the urgent necessity of having a descriptive catalogue of the rich store of Manuscripts left in the Sarfoji Saraswati Mahal Library known as the Tanjore Palace Library. The Government entrusted the onerous task to Prof. Sastri and he brought out 19 volumes of descriptive catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts and one volume of descriptive catalogue of Telugu Manuscripts.

All this Prof. Sastri did as a labour of love in addition to his own other duties solely for the cause of advancement of Sanskrit learning and Research. And if the library is now taking steps to print unpublished works in a series under the appellation of the Saraswati

Mahal series, the work done by Prof. Sastri alone is instrumental for this renaissance.

Prof. Sastri in his enthusiasm edited a number of minor stotras and appended the same to one volume of the descriptive catalogue. He had to be brief in the last three volumes owing to paucity of Government funds and in fact a few more volumes would have been published if more money were available.

Prof. Sastri was Curator of the Madras Government Manuscripts Library in addition to his own duties as Professor of Sanskrit at the College. In this capacity he edited several volumes of Descriptive Catalogue in Sanskrit and in the Dravidian languages. To each of the volumes he has appended several important notes on the newly discovered manuscripts as the *Pañcapādikā Vyākhyā* etc. These notes on manuscripts are really important sources of information for the research student and scholar. He was instrumental in having an index prepared in 2 volumes of all the manuscripts with an Author Index as the 3rd volume. In addition he edited several books as *Rāmānuja Champu* in the Madras Government Manuscript Oriental Series; and he has appended a note on the history of South Indian Vaishnavism to the said book.

Prof. Sastri was one of the members of the Advisory Board of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute at Tirupati and directed its Sanskrit research activities. There is a Journal published by the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute and Prof. Sastri edited some works like the *Aditya Stotra.* As Sanskrit manuscripts are found in several libraries in South India Prof. Sastri felt that an Author index of the Sanskrit manuscripts in the libraries in South India would meet the long-felt needs of the scholar and has compiled an Index. The same has been given to the Director, Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute and is awaiting publication.

Prof. Sastri was instrumental in getting the Sankara Gurukulam of Srirangam to start the Journal of the Sankara Gurukulam. 18 parts have been issued. Prof. Sastri was the literary advisor to that Journal. One special feature of the Journal was that Prof. Sastri began publishing several hitherto unpublished works like the *Nayamañjarī* of Appayya Dīkshita, *Sriṅgāra Prakāśa* of Bhoja and *Bāla Bhārata* of Agastya Paṇḍita and they have been edited with suitable introductions; and many more works are still running publication for the first time in that Journal.

Prof. Sastri contributed several articles to journals and commemoration volumes. To mention a few, he contributed an informing article on the "Dīkshitars of the 16th century" to the Rāja

Annamalai Chettiar commemoration volume. He contributed an article on "Appayya Dikshitar and the authenticity of his quotations" to the K. V. Rangaswami Iyengar Commemoration volume. Viśvarūpa author of *Bālakrīdā* and Viśvarūpa *alias* Sureśvarāchārya is the article in the Kane Commemoration volume.

Prof. Sastri took a deep interest in Advaita Philosophy. He wrote a foreword to the *Brakma Siddhi* of Maṇḍana edited by Prof. Kuppuswami Śāstri in the Madras Govt Oriental Manuscript Series. In this Prof. Sastri established the traditional view of the identity of Maṇḍana and Sureśvara by references to several passages from their works.

I may add that in this Prof. Sastri is supported by the scholars in Benares and Prayāg, the late Mm. Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, Prof. Ranade Mm. Gopinath Kaviraj and Mm. Dr. Umesh Misra of the Allahabad University. Prof. Sastri's defence has led to further contributions on the subject from other scholars.

Prof. Sastri edited Appayya Dikshita's *Siddhānta Leśa Saṅgraha* with commentary in the Sri Vani Vilas Series and in a valuable preface has fixed the date of Appayya Dikshita with referenee to the horoscope and inscriptions.

Prof. Sastri edited the *Bhāva Prakāśa* of Chitsukhāchārya along with Mm. Anantakrishna Sastrigal of the Calcutta University and the same is published in Part III of the Calcutta Sanskrit Series No. 1. The *Bhāva Prakāśa* has been published only up to the end of Pada ii Adhyaya II and the remaining portion awaits publication and completion at the hands of Mm. Anantakrishna Sastrigal. The puplication of *Bhāva Prakāśa* will do credit to any scholar and is a substantial contribution to Advaita Literature.

Prof. Sastri had a great love and attachment for his *gurus.* He edited the Kuppuswami Sāstri commemoration volume.

Prof. Sastri thought that he should pay his debt to his *guru* in England, Prof. A. A. Macdonell and as a Dakshiṇa translated in Sanskrit the 1st 9 chapters of A. A. Macdonell's Sanskrit Literature. Mm. Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha has added a foreword commending the same to the Sanskrit Siromanis in the Pāthasālas as introducing the new stores of Western scholarship to the Sanskrit (alone) knowing Pandit of India.

Prof. Sastri loved his *Alma mater*, the Presidency College whieh alone gave him all that he attained in his later days as a Professor and scholar. The centenary celebrations of the College came off in 1940 and Prof Sastri was instrumental in getting a Presidency College Register compiled from 1840—1940 giving an account of all the Presidencians—on the lines of the Balliol College Register. The

success of the centenary owed not a little in other directions also, as the enacting of a Sanskrit Drama, to Prof. Sastri.

Prof. Sastri was the disciple of H. H. the Jagadguru of the Sringeri Mutt and when H. H. was the Pontiff for 27 years Prof. Sastri edited the *Bhakta-Kusumāñjali* containing 27 essays in Sanskrit and 97 essays in English. The place of honour in the *Bhakta-Kusumāñjali* was given to Dr. Sir Mm. Ganganatha Jha who wrote an article on the Achārya Vedānta. Prof. Sastri contributed an article on the Suresvara—Maṇdana identity.

It should be said to the credit of Prof. Sastri that as the joint Secretary of the IIIrd Oriental Conference held in Madras in 1921 under the presidency of Mm. Dr. Sir Ganganatha Jha, Prof. Sastri was instrumental for its splendid success and the printed proceedings of the Oriental Conference will bear witness of this.

There are a few works left by Prof. Sastri which are worth publication. (*a*) He has left the manuscript of the *Yuddha Kāṇḍa Part II* critically edited according to the South Indian Recension. (*b*) He has translated into English the introduction and phonology portion of Wackernagel's Ancient Sanskrit Grammar. (*c*) He has left a manuscript copy of the 3 lectures delivered by him in the Madras University on the Advanced and Scientific study of Sanskrit with special refernce to the *Rig Veda*.

Prof. Sastri had many ambitions unfulfilled and the following are the same.

(a) A research student was working under Prof. Sastri on the *Pañchapādikā*. Piof. Sastri wanted to edit the *Pañchapādikā* with all the newly discovered commentaries on the same.

(b) Prof. Sastri loved among the later day Sanskrit poems Appayya Dīkshita's *Atmārpaṇa Stuti* and wanted to have an edition of the same with English translation.

(c) The last was his mighty ambitious project of bringing out a memorial edition of all the works of Appayya Dīkshita the famous scholar of South India before the tercentenary of Appayya Dīkshita which falls in 1953

If Prof. Sastri had been alive his ambitions would have been fulfilled. But it now remains to be seen as to who will shoulder the responsibility of editing especially the memorial edition of Appayya Dīkshita whose versatility and catholicity makes him the greatest of the galaxy of Sanskrit scholars and Philosophers after Vachaspati and Vidyāraṇya.

A. S. NATARAJA AYYAR.

REVIEW.

MAHABHARATA : BHISMAPARVAN I edited by Dr. S. K. Belvalkar, M.A., Ph. D., Bhandarkar Oiiental Research Institute, Poona.

The latest fascicule 15 which is before us of the *Mahābhārata* critical edition is the first part of the Bhīṣmaparvan. This has been edited by the General Editor, Rao Bahadur Sripad Krishna Belvalkar who had been at it for a number of years. He has already contributed very many critical papers on the *Gītā*. Dr. Belvalkar is a close student of the Bhīṣmaparvan and as it is to be expected the Bhīṣmaparvan is almost the beginning of the end of the Great War and it strangely as it may seen contains cosmological material, and the *Gītā*, the Song Celestial and the Universal Gospel of the man who is growing to his own fullest height of divinity in the Godhead. We are having a definitive edition of the *Gītā* so far as the text goes, though we are perhaps nowhere nearer a definitive point of view in respect of the thought and theology or metaphysics contained in it. The *Gītā* that the great masters like Śaṅkara, Rāmānuja and Madhva used was a South Indian edition and it is certainly definitive, but with the critical edition we are made to see that there are at least quite a number of variant readings in the *Gītā* itself. The editor has utilised the vast material regarding the text of the Bhīṣmaparvan' almost all the commentaries on the *Gītā* including of course the Kashmirian recension. The editor has promised to elucidate and consider critically in the next fascicule (fascicule 16) the points raised by several scholars about the 'Original Gītā,' whether it was very much attenuated or very much bigger than the present traditional version. Dr. Belvalkar however intimates that in his most considered view the present recension of 18 chapters is perhaps the original form.

The present fascicule as already remarked contains important sections regarding cosmology of the world, which perhaps formed the critical stage when the Pāṇḍavas beaten severely by the valiant and terrible Bhīṣma finally knowing that Bhīṣma for some reasons of prestige and Kṣatriya honour would not fight Śikhaṇḍi, the woman-made-man, were placing Śikhaṇḍi before Bhīṣma with Arjuna behind him, so as to lay Bhīṣma down.

The *Gītā* portion it seems has been issued separately for the purposes of making it accessible to scholars interested in the *Gītā* alone,

We await the next fascicule with eager interest as that is said to contain fuller details and conclusions arrived at by the learned Editor. The work has lost nothing of the greatness and scholarship that marks the productions of the Mahābhārata Committee, and keeps up the high standard set up already.

The editor wrongly names Veṅkaṭanātha's commentary on Śrī Rāmānuja's *Gitā-Bhāṣya*. The correct name of the work is *Tātparyacandrikā* and not *Tātpāryaprakāśikā* (p. vii of the editorial note).

It may also be pointed out that Veṅkaṭanātha quotes under chapter 11 of the B.G (Critical ed. ch. 33 Bh.P) after 16th verse the following verses which he states have been written down by some on which he comments :

केचित्पाञ्च श्लोकान्पठन्ति इति विलिख्य व्याख्यातम् :

अर्जुन उवाच :

भवत्येष कथं कृष्ण कथं चैष विवर्धते ।
किमात्मकः किमाचारस्तन्ममाचक्ष्व पृच्छतः ॥

भगवानुवाच:

एष सूक्ष्मः परश्शत्रुर्देहिनामिन्द्रियैस्सह ।
सुखं तन्न इवासीनो मोहयन्पार्थ तिष्ठति ॥

कामक्रोधमयो धीरस्स्तम्भहर्षसमुद्भवः ।
अहङ्कारोऽभिमानात्मा दुस्तरः पापकर्मभिः ॥

हर्षमस्य निवर्त्यैष शोकमस्य ददाति च ।
भयं चास्य करोत्येष मोहयंश्च मुहुर्मुहुः ॥

स एष कलुषः क्षुद्रश्छिद्रापेक्षी धनञ्जय ।
रजः प्रवर्तितो मोहान्मानुषाणामुपद्रवः ॥

दिव्यानि कर्माणि तवाद्भुतानि पूर्वाणि पूर्वेऽप्यृषयस्स्तुवन्ति ।
नान्योऽस्ति कर्ता जगतस्त्वमेको धाता विधाता च विभुर्भवश्च ॥

He also quotes some other verses listed more or less here under 27, 33, 39, 40, and 44 many of which are stated by Veṅkaṭanātha as referred to by Nārāyaṇa, an older writer than himself (12th century writer).

K. C. VARADACHARI.

The following books have been gratefully received.

		Rs.	A.	P.
1.	History of Orissa—by L. N. Sahu, M.A., Servants of India Society, Poona, 1946 ...	0	8	0
2.	The Commemoration Volume of Sri Sundaresa Sarma, Tanjore ...	2	0	0
3.	Sūtrānuguṇyasiddhivimarśa—by A. V. Gopalachariar, M.A., B.L., Trichy ...	1	0	0
4.	Vikramāṅkadevacharita—Ed. by Murari Lal Sastri, Saraswati Bhavan Text series No. 8, Allahabad ...	2	12	0
5.	Tautātitamatatilaka—Pt. III by Bhavadeva Misra, S B. T. Series No 70, Allahabad ...	2	12	0
6.	Jagdvijayacchandas—by Kavindracharya, Ed. by Madhava Krishna Sarma, Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner ...	1	8	0
7.	Tulasī—by Ramesh Divedi, Himayalan Herbal Institute, Lahore ...	2	0	0
8.	Prabandha-catuṣṭayam—by Gopal Rao Aterwala; Scindia Oriental Institute, Ujjain ...	2	0	0
9.	Juridical Studies in Ancient Indian Law—by Ludwick Sternback; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.	2	0	0
10.	Saṅgītarāja—by Kālasena (Kumbha) Ed by Dr C. Kunhan Raja, Anup Sanskrit Library, Bikaner			
11.	Anyoktyaṣṭaka-saṅgraha—Ed. by Pratibha D. Trivedi; Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay ...			
12.	A Handbook on British Commonwealth and Empire—Published by U. K Publicity Office, New Delhi, 1946 ...			
13.	Tiruppāvai—by Godadevi ...	0	10	0
14.	Mysore Archæological Report for 1944, Govt. of Mysore, Mysore ...			
15.	Travancore Archæological Report for 1120 M.E. Govt. of Travancore, Trivandrum ...			
16.	A Report on the working of Pudukkottai State Museum, Pudukkottai State for Fasli, 1352, 1353, 1354 ...			
17	Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress, U.S.A., New York for 1945–46 ...			

श्रीः

तत्पुरुषादिसमासीयाः संज्ञा अन्वर्थाः।

BY

T. VENKATACHARYA

Vyakaraṇa Siromani

वयस्यैः सहासं 'समासीयसंज्ञाः
ध्रुवं ह्यर्थवत्यो महाभाष्यरीत्या'।
इतीदं प्रवक्तुं भृशं चोदितोऽहं
गुरून् सम्प्रणम्य ब्रुवेऽलावधेयम् ॥

श्रीपाणिनीये व्याकरणे बह्व्यः संज्ञा निर्दिष्टास्सन्ति। ताः सर्वा अपि संज्ञाः प्रायशः प्राचीनाचार्यैः तत्तद्व्याकरणेषु कृता एव इहानूदिताः। प्राचीने ह्यथर्वप्रातिशाख्ये धातुप्रातिपदिकप्रत्ययादिसंज्ञा दृश्यन्ते। 'तथा च आथर्वणे पठ्यते को धातुः? किं प्रातिपदिकम्? कः प्रत्ययः इति' इत्येवं **प्रौढमनोरमाया**मप्युपात्तम्।

किञ्च '**वृद्धिरादैच्**' इति सूत्रे **भाष्ये** 'वृद्धिरित्येषा संज्ञा' इति बोधयितुं 'संज्ञा' इत्यधिकारः कर्तव्य इत्याशङ्क्य, असत्यपि संज्ञाधिकारे, वृद्धिसंज्ञायाः प्राचीनाचार्यैरेव कृतत्वात्, तस्याश्चेह **पाणिनिना** निर्देशात्, वृद्धिरित्यस्य संज्ञात्वे न कश्चिदपि सन्दिहीतेति संज्ञाधिकारो न कर्तव्य इत्युक्तम्। **तद्भाष्य**ग्रन्थश्चेत्थम्—

'अस्थाने अयं यत्नः (संज्ञाधिकारः कर्तव्य इति) क्रियते। नहीदं लोकाद्भिद्यते। यदीदं लोकाद्भिद्येत तदा यत्नार्हं स्यात्। तद्यथा—अगोज्ञाय कश्चिद्गां सक्थनि कर्णे वा गृहीत्वा उपदिशति 'इयं गौरि'ति। न चास्मायाचष्टे 'इयमस्य संज्ञे'ति। भवति चास्य सम्प्रत्ययः। (ततः प्रष्टा पृच्छति) 'तत्रैतत्स्यात् कृतस्तत्र पूर्वैरभिसम्बन्धः इति'। (समाधाता आह) 'इहापि कृतः पूर्वैरभिसम्बन्धः'। कैः? आचार्यैः इति।

तथा च **एतद्भाष्येण** पूर्वाचार्यविहितवृद्धिसंज्ञायाः **पाणिनिना** निर्देशात्, तस्याः संज्ञात्वे न सन्देहसम्भव इति कथनात्, **पाणिनिः** पूर्वाचार्यकृताः संज्ञा एव इहानुवदतीति फलति। इममभिप्रायमेव **भट्टोजिदीक्षितो**ऽपि **कौमुद्यां** 'प्रथमादयः सप्तम्यन्ताः प्राचां संज्ञाः ताभिरिहापि व्यवहारः' इत्येवमाविष्करोति। 'महासंज्ञाकरणं प्राचामनुरोधात्' इति **शेखरे**ऽप्युक्तम्।

एवञ्च धातुप्रातिपदिकप्रत्ययादिसंज्ञाः **पाणिने**रपि प्राचीना एव स्वशास्त्रेप्याद्दृताः इति युज्यते अभिधातुम् ।

एवन्त्वे **समाससंज्ञा** तथा **अव्ययीभाव, तत्पुरुष, द्विगु, कर्मधारय, बहुव्रीहि, द्वन्द्व**रूपतद्विशेषसंज्ञाश्च प्राचीनाचार्यकृता एव इहानूदिताः इति कथनं न दुष्यति ।

कैयटोऽपि **'नदीभिश्च'** इति सूत्रे 'पूर्वाचार्यविहितगुरुसंज्ञाश्रयणात्, यदुपाधीनां पूर्वाचार्याः संज्ञा व्यधिषत तदुपाधीनामेव एता भवन्ति' इत्येवं अव्ययीभावसंज्ञाप्रस्तावे तस्याः तत्कृतत्वं ब्रवीति । तथा **नागेशो**ऽपि **'अव्ययं विभक्ति'**त्यादिसूत्रीय 'अन्वर्थसंज्ञा विज्ञानात्' इति **कैयट**प्रतीकमुपादाय 'प्राचीनोक्तमहासंज्ञाकरणेन तत्सम्मतोऽर्थोपि अस्य सम्मत इति भावः' इति लिखन् अस्मिन् अर्थे संवदते ।

तत्र 'दश समानाः' इत्येवं समानादिप्राचीनसंज्ञानां **पाणिनिना** अग्रहणात्, कनिष्ठिकामात्रमपि प्रमाणमनुपलभ्य 'सर्वा अपि प्राचीनसंज्ञाः **पाणिनिना** अनूदिता' इति वक्तुं नैव पार्यते ।

संज्ञानामन्वर्थत्वम्

अथ **पाणिन्युपात्ता**नां सर्वासामपि संज्ञानां किमन्वर्थता प्रतिपादयितुं शक्या? इति शङ्का तु अञ्जसा समाधानं न लभते । तत्र कासाञ्चित् '**सर्वनामसङ्ख्या**प्रभृतीनां संज्ञानां परं **भाष्यकार** एव सुविशदमन्वर्थतां प्रतिपाद्य तेन किञ्चिदतिरिक्तं प्रयोजनं निर्वर्तयति ।

सोयं **महाभाष्यकारः** एव '**इकोयणची**'ति सूत्रे 'सामर्थ्ययोगान्न हि किञ्चिदत्र पश्यामि शास्त्रे यदनर्थकं स्यात्' इति वदन्, '**वृद्धि**'सूत्रे 'प्रमाणभूतः आचार्यः दर्भ-पवित्रपाणिः शुचाववकाशे प्राङ्मुखः उपविश्य महता प्रयासेन सूत्राणि प्रणयति स्म । तत्र अशक्यं वर्णेनाप्यनर्थकेन भवितुम्' इत्येवं प्रस्तौति । तत्र वृद्धिसंज्ञासूत्रे संज्ञाधिकाराभावे 'दश दाडिमानि षडपूपाः' इत्यादिवाक्यवत् अस्य सूत्रस्य अनर्थकत्वमायाति इति **वार्तिककृतो**क्ते, तत्समाधानार्थं 'तत्राशक्यं वर्णेनाप्यनर्थकेन भवितुम्' इति **भाष्यं** प्रवृत्तम् । इह अर्थशब्दः न प्रयोजनपरः । किन्तु अभिधेयपरः । **शेखरे**ऽपि 'वृद्धिसूत्रस्थे वर्णेनाप्यनर्थकेन न भवितव्यम्' इति भाष्यग्रन्थे अनर्थकत्वं बोध्यार्थराहित्यरूपमिति, न निष्प्रयोजनत्वरूपानर्थक्येन तत्र तत्र प्रत्याख्यानपरभाष्यासङ्गतिः' इत्युक्तम् । 'वर्णेनापि' इत्यस्य च 'अपि वेदान्तपारगम्' 'अपि वा मातरं गच्छेत्' इत्याद्यपिशब्दघटित-वाक्यस्य स्वार्थे तात्पर्याभाववत्, न वर्णांशे अर्थवत्वप्रतिज्ञानं विवक्षितम् । परन्तु समुदायस्य अर्थवत्वप्रतिज्ञानमेवाभीप्सितम् । वर्णांशेत्वर्थव दः सः । एवञ्च अर्थवत्त्वस्यैव प्रतिज्ञानात्,

प्रयोजनाभावेन प्रत्याख्यातानामपि 'न बहुव्रीहौ' इत्यादीनाम् अर्थवत्त्वस्य निर्विवादत्वेन, न प्रतिज्ञाहानिः, नापि प्रत्याख्यानासङ्गतिरिति शेखराभिप्रायः। तदित्थम्—प्रदर्शितभाष्येण पाणिनीयं किञ्चिदप्यनर्थकं न भवतीति कथनात्, तत्र तत्र 'महासंज्ञाकरणमन्वर्थत्वाय। अन्यथा हि टिघुभादिवदेकाक्षरा संज्ञा क्रियेत। लघ्वर्थं हि संज्ञाकरणम्। संज्ञा च नाम, यतो न लघीयः।' इत्येवं कथनाच्च 'इह बृहत्संज्ञाकरणं यद्यदस्ति, तत्सर्वं अन्वर्थत्वगर्भितमि'ति सूच्यते।

तत्र याश्च प्राचीनाः संज्ञा आदृताः, तासां किं प्राचीनाचार्या एव अन्वर्थत्वममंसत? इति पृच्छा तु तदीयव्याकरणादिसमुचितप्रमाणाभावात् अशक्यसमाधाना। पाणिनिः परं, तासां तथाऽऽदरणादेव अन्वर्थत्वमनुमन्यत एवेति शक्यमध्यवसातुम्। अन्यथा हि बृहतीः ताः संज्ञाः प्रहाय टिघुभादिवदेकाक्षरसंज्ञाकरणे स्वैरं प्रावर्तिष्यत, लाघवानुरोधात्।

तदेवं बृहत्सञ्ज्ञानामन्वर्थत्वं पाणिन्यभिमतमितिसिद्धे, तत्र या पुनः समाससंज्ञा आदृता, सेयं किमन्वर्थैव? इतीदं किञ्चिदालोच्यते।

पाणिनिस्तु क्वापि कस्या अपि अन्वर्थतां स्वयं न ब्रवीति इति विदितमेवेदम्। भाष्यकारः पुनः यथा अन्यत्र अन्वर्थसंज्ञास्थले सुविशदं अन्वर्थतां प्रतिपादयति, तथा समाससंज्ञायाः अन्वर्थतां नैव कण्ठतो ब्रवीति। परन्तु 'सहसुपे'त्यादिस्थलेषु क्वचित् 'सुपा सह समस्यते' इति विवरणमात्रं तदीयं दृश्यते। कैयटस्तु—'सहसुपेति सूत्रे 'प्रत्येकं समाससंज्ञावारणार्थं सहग्रहणं' इति प्रतिपादनसमये 'कथञ्च कृत्वा एकैकस्य प्राप्नोति' इति भाष्यमुपादाय 'एकार्थीभावे समासविधानात्, समुदायस्यैव च विशिष्टार्थाभिधायित्वात्, तस्यैव संस्कार्यत्वात् प्राधान्यात्, समुदायस्यैव हि द्विर्वचनवत् समाससंज्ञा भविष्यति, अन्वर्थसंज्ञाविज्ञानाद्वेति भावः' इति लिखन् समाससंज्ञायाः अन्वर्थतां मुक्तकण्ठमावेदयति।

नागेशः पुनः उक्तकैयटीयं 'अन्वर्थसंज्ञाविज्ञनाद्वा' इत्येतत् प्रतीकयित्वा 'वस्तुतः समसनं संक्षेप इत्यन्वर्थः। न चासावनेकस्यैब, एकस्यापि विस्तृतस्य संक्षेपदर्शनात्। अतः अन्वर्थत्वेन कथमेतदर्थलाभ इति चिन्त्यम्। तस्मात् गर्गदण्डनन्यायसत्त्वात् कथमेकैकस्य प्राप्तिः, लक्ष्यानुसाराच्च तस्यैव न्यायस्य आश्रयणमिति सिद्धान्तिन एव प्रश्नः' इत्येवं कैयटं क्वचिदंशे खण्डयन्नपि, अन्वर्थतायाः स्वानभिमतत्वसूचकतया किञ्चदप्यलेखनात्, एवं 'सहसुपे'ति सूत्रशेखरे 'सम्पूर्वकास्यतेः संश्लेषोऽर्थः इति लेखनाच्च अन्वर्थतां मन्यते इति भाति।

तथा **नागेशात्** प्राचीनः **तत्त्वबोधिनीकारः** '**प्राक् कडारात्समासः** इति सूत्रे 'समसनं समासः । भावे घञ् । अनेकस्य पदस्य एकपदीभवनम् इत्येके । .... नन्वन्वर्थत्वात्समाससंज्ञायाः प्रत्येकमप्रसङ्गात् सहग्रहणं व्यर्थमित्याशङ्क्याह—योगो विभज्यते इति ।' इत्येवं **कैयटा**शयं स्पष्टं संवदते ।

तदित्थम्—समासादि बृहत्संज्ञानां सर्वासां अन्वर्थत्वस्य **भाष्यकृता** स्पष्टमविवरणेऽपि, यत्र किञ्चिदतिरिक्तं प्रयोजनमस्ति तत्रैवान्वर्थत्वविवरणस्य **भाष्यकृ**च्छैलीत्वात्, **पाणिनीयमेक** मप्यक्षरमनर्थकं **न** भवतीति तेनैवोक्तत्वात्, तथा—क्वचिदन्वर्थतायाः प्रतिपादनाच्च, यत्र यत्र अन्वर्थत्वं सम्भवति तत्र तत्र 'केवलं इयं संज्ञा, नास्या अवयवार्थोऽस्ति' इति कथनापेक्षया, संज्ञानामन्वर्थत्वकथनमेवोचितमित्यभिप्रेत्य **कैयटा**दयः समाससंज्ञाया अप्यन्वर्थताम् प्रत्यपीपदन् ।

एवं मन्यमानास्त एव **कैयटा**दयः समासविशेषसंज्ञानाममन्वर्थत्वं नैव प्रतिपादयन्तीति शोचनीयमेतत् । तत्र अव्ययीभावस्य परं **भाष्यकार** एव 'अनव्ययमव्ययं भवतीत्य व्ययीभावः' इत्येवमन्वर्थतां दर्शयति ।

तदितरतत्पुरुषादिविशेषसंज्ञानां तैरप्रतिपादनेऽपि अन्वर्थता किञ्चिदिव वक्तुं शक्येति, तथा—संज्ञानामन्वर्थत्वमवश्यं वक्तव्यमिति निर्बन्धाभावेऽपि सति सम्भवे अन्वर्थत्वकथनं न दोषाय, प्रत्युत तदेवोचितमिति च अभिसन्धाय इदं किञ्चिन्निवेद्यते । तत्राव्ययीभाव-संज्ञायाः **भाष्य** एवोक्तत्वात् इतरासां समासविशेषसंज्ञानामन्वर्थत्वं निरूप्यते ।

तत्पुरुषः

(१) **पुरुषशब्दः पुरुशब्दस्य** '**षणु**' दाने इति धातोश्च समावेशान्निष्पद्यते । तथा च **तौ**=पूर्वोत्तरावयवौ, **पुरु**=नानाविधत्वेन प्रभूतं, **सनोति**=ददाति (प्रतिपादयति) आदत्ते वा इत्यर्थे तत्पुरुषपदं अन्वर्थं भविष्यति । तत्पुरुषसमासे हि—'**विशेषणं विशेष्येण बहुलं**,' '**द्वितीयाश्रितातीतपतितगतात्यस्तप्राप्तापन्नैः**,' '**तृतीया तत्कृतार्थेन गुणवचनेन**,' '**चतुर्थी तदर्थार्थबलिहितसुखरक्षितैः**,' '**पञ्चमी भयेन**', '**षष्ठी**', '**सप्तमीशौण्डैः**,' इत्येवंरीत्या प्रथमाप्रभृतिसप्तमीपर्यन्तविभक्त्यन्तस्य बहोः पूर्वावयवत्वं प्रतिपाद्यते । तथा '**कुगतिप्रादयः**' इत्येवं गतिसंज्ञकस्य प्रादेश्च एतत्समासपूर्वावयवत्वं स्पष्टमेव । एवं '**कर्तृकरणे कृता**' इति कृदन्तस्य उत्तरावयवत्वं बोध्यते । (इह कृतदन्स्यैव उत्तरावयवत्वं '**गतिकारकोपपदानां कृद्भिः सह समासवचनं प्राक्सुबुत्पत्तेः**' इत्युक्तेः ।) '**कृत्यै ऋणे**' इति कृत्यप्रत्ययान्तस्यापि उत्तरावयवत्वमुक्तम् । '**सहसुपा**'

इत्यतः सुपा इत्यनुवर्तनात् सुबन्तस्य उत्तरावयत्वं प्रसिद्धमेव । '**आख्यातमाख्यातेन क्रियासातत्ये**' '**एहीडादयोऽन्यपदार्थे**' इत्येवं तिङन्तस्यापि पूर्वोत्तरावयत्वं तत्पुरुषे एव अस्ति ।

तदित्थम्—अस्मिन् समासे इतरसमासवैलक्षण्येन नानाविधस्य शब्दस्य पूर्वोत्तरावयवत्वकथनात्, **तौ**=पूर्वोत्तरावयवौ, **पुरु**=नानाविधत्वेन प्रभूतं, **सनोति**=ददाति आदत्ते वा इत्यर्थकः तत्पुरुषव्यवहारः युक्ततर एवेत्याभाति ।

इतरसमासेषु **सप्तविभक्त्यन्तानां**, **गतिसंज्ञकस्य**, **प्रादेः**, **कृदन्तस्य**, **कृत्यप्रत्ययान्तस्य**, **तिङन्तस्ये**त्येवं बहुविधस्य पूर्वोत्तरावयत्वेन अकथनात्, तद्वैलक्षण्येन तत्पुरुषसमासे परं तत्तादृशस्य तथा कथनात्, तत्पुरुषशब्दस्य अन्वर्थत्वं सङ्गच्छते एव ।

(२) तत्पुरुषशब्दान्वर्थत्वविषये केचिदेवमपि वक्तुं शक्यमिति वदन्ति । तद्यथा—

तानि=एतत्समासलक्ष्याणि, **पुरु**=अस्य तत्पुरुषस्य इतरसर्वसमासीयौत्सर्गिकप्रयोजकाकारविशिष्टनानालक्ष्यास्कन्दित्वेन, **प्रभूतं**, **सनोति** प्रतिपादयत्यादत्ते वा इत्यर्थात् अन्वर्थत्वं सुनिर्वहम् । तत्र हि समासेषु पूर्वपदार्थप्राधान्यादिकं औत्सर्गिकं अङ्गीकृतं समस्ति । अयञ्च तत्पुरुषः '**प्राप्तापन्ने च द्वितीयया**' इत्यादिसूत्रस्थले पूर्वपदार्थप्राधान्यं भजते। तथा '**द्वितीयाश्रितातीते**' त्यादिविषये उत्तरपदार्थप्राधान्यं, '**तद्धितार्थोत्तरपदसमाहारे च**' इत्यत्र समाहारे प्रवृत्त्या, वीरः पुरुष इत्यत्र **मञ्जूषायां** कृतं शाब्दबोधवर्णनमनुसृत्य वीरत्वपुरुषत्वसमूहवान् इति बोधाकारस्य सिद्ध्या कर्मधारयस्य द्वन्द्वसमशीलत्वात् उभयपदार्थ प्राधान्यं, '**तद्धितार्थे**'ति द्विगुस्थले तद्धितार्थस्यान्यपदार्थत्वात् तदुपाधिकतया द्विगुतत्पुरुषप्रवृत्त्या, तथा—'**एहीडादयोऽन्यपदार्थे**' इत्यन्यपदार्थे विधानाच्च, अन्यपदार्थ प्राधान्यञ्च **अश्नुते** इति इतरसर्वसमासीयौत्सर्गिकप्रयोजकाकारविशिष्टनानालक्ष्यास्कन्दित्वात् तत्पुरुषसंज्ञा अन्वर्था सुयोजा । उभयपदार्थप्राधान्यग्राहित्वं अव्ययीभावस्य **न घटते** । बहुव्रीहेः द्वन्द्वस्य च पूर्वोत्तरान्यतरप्राधान्यग्राहित्वं शशशृङ्गायितम् । इति ।

(३) **सचासौ पुरुषश्च**, **तस्य वा पुरुषः** तत्पुरुष इत्येवं, तत्पुरुषशब्दः किञ्चित्तत्पुरुषसमासस्य स्वयमेव प्रतिपादकोऽपि भवति । परन्तु सर्वविधतत्पुरुषसमासस्य अस्मिन् तत्पुरुषपदे प्रतिपादनं दुश्शकम् ।

द्विगुः

(१) '**सङ्ख्यापूर्वो द्विगु**'रिति सूत्रेण, '**तद्धितार्थे**'ति सूत्रविहितस्य, सङ्ख्यापूर्वस्य तत्पुरुषस्य द्विगुरितिसंज्ञा क्रियते । तदितरसूत्रविहितस्य तु सङ्ख्या

पूर्वकस्यापि तत्पुरुषस्य इयं द्विगुसंज्ञा न भवति। एतत्समासपूर्वावयत्वेन सङ्ख्याशब्दस्य प्रसङ्गे द्विशब्दादारभ्य वर्तमान एव सङ्ख्याशब्दः उपस्थास्यते। न त्वेकशब्दोऽपि। तस्य हि '**पूर्वकालैक**'त्यादिसूत्रे ग्रहणात् तेनैव सूत्रेण समासविधानं, न पुनः '**तद्धितार्थे**'तिसूत्रेण। एवञ्च '**तद्धितार्थे**'ति सूत्रविहितस्यैव सङ्ख्यापूर्वस्य, द्विगुसंज्ञाविधानात्, '**पूर्वकालैक**' तिसूत्रविहिते '**एकवीर**' इत्यादौ (एकशब्दपूर्वके) द्विगुसंज्ञायाः अप्रवृत्तेः, द्विगु-समासे द्व्यादिसङ्ख्याशब्दस्यैव पूर्वावयत्वेन प्रवेश इति स्थितम्। ततश्च द्विगुशब्दस्य अन्वर्थता सुप्रतिपादा। तदित्थम्—**द्विः**=द्विशब्दः **प्रभृतिः** यस्य सः द्विप्रभृतिः। सङ्ख्याशब्दः अन्यपदार्थः। **द्विप्रभृतिं**=द्व्यादिसङ्ख्याशब्दं **गच्छति**=स्वपूर्वावयव-सङ्ख्याशब्दत्वेन प्राप्नोति इति द्विप्रभृतिगुः। तत्र प्रभृतिशब्दस्य लोपे द्विगुरासीत्। '**गमेर्डोस**' इत्येवं गो इति रूपस्यैव सिद्ध्या नेदं गम्लृधातो रूपम्। परन्तु गुङ्=गतौ इति तत्समानार्थकस्य क्विपि इदं रूपं सिद्ध्यति। ततश्च द्विप्रभृतिं गच्छतीत्यर्थकः द्विगुव्यवहारः युक्त एव।

(२) इह प्रकारान्तरेणापि द्विगुशब्दस्य अन्वर्थत्वं प्रतिपादयितुं शक्यमिति भाति। तद्यथा—तत्पुरुषसंज्ञां निमित्तीकृत्य द्विगोः टच्, अच्, इति द्वावेव प्रत्ययौ भवतः। टच उदाहरणं पञ्चराजम्, पञ्चगवम्। अच उदाहरणं द्व्यङ्गुलम्। ततश्च **द्वौ**=टजचौ प्रत्ययौ **गच्छति**=तत्पुरुषसंज्ञाफलत्वेन प्राप्नोति इति द्विगुः। पूर्ववदेव गुङ्धातोः क्विपि गु शब्दः निष्पद्यते। इति। किन्तु 'यदि द्विगुसमासात् तत्पुरुषसंज्ञानिबन्धनः प्रत्ययः प्रवर्तेत तर्हि टजजन्यतर एव प्रवर्त्स्यति' इत्येवमर्थाङ्गीकारे एव इदमन्वर्थत्वप्रतिपादनं घटेत। 'यो यो द्विगुः स सर्वोऽपि तत्पुरुषसंज्ञां निमित्तीकृत्य टचं अचं वा लभते' इत्यर्थवर्णने तु अन्वर्थत्वं न सङ्गंस्यते 'पञ्चफली इत्यादिस्थलेषु टचः अचो वा अप्रवृत्तेः, इतीदं किञ्चिन्मनसि कर्तव्यम्।

कर्मधारयः

द्वयोः प्रथमान्तयोः '**विशेषणं विशेष्येण**' इत्यनेन वा तदपवादेन वा सूत्रेण विहितस्य समानाधिकरणपदावयवकस्य तत्पुरुषस्य '**तत्पुरुषः समानाधिकरणः कर्मधारयः**' इति सूत्रेण कर्मधारयसंज्ञा विधीयते।

'**सर्वधातुभ्यो मनिन्**' इत्यौणादिकसूत्रेण कृञ्धातो भावेऽर्थे मनिन् प्रत्यये 'क्रियते इति कर्म' इत्येवं क्रियार्थो कर्मशब्दो व्युत्पन्नः। धृङ् अवस्थाने इति दैवादिकस्य णिचि **धारयतीत्यर्थे** '**अनुपसर्गाल्लिम्पविन्दधारि**' इत्यादिपाणिनीयसूत्रेण शप्रत्यये धारयः इति रूपम्। धारकः, अवस्थापकः इति तदर्थः। ततश्च **कर्म**=क्रियां,

धारयति=पूर्वपदार्थस्य उत्तरपदार्थस्य च विषये साम्येन अवस्थापयतीति कर्मधारयः। अर्थात् अयं भावः—विशेषणविशेष्ययोरेव कर्मधारयसमासप्रवृत्त्या, विशेषणपदेन विशेष्यपदेन च एकस्यैव अर्थस्य विशेष्यतया अभिधानात्, विशेष्यपदबोध्यः योऽर्थः यस्यां क्रियायां येन सम्बन्धेन अन्वेति, तेनैव सम्बन्धेन विशेषणपदबोध्यस्यापि तस्यैव अर्थस्य तस्यां क्रियायां अन्वययोग्यत्वसम्भवात्, पूर्वपदार्थस्य उत्तरपदार्थस्य च विषये (पूर्वपदार्थत्वोत्तर-पदार्थत्वव्यवहारः विग्रहवाक्ये अनुसन्धेयः) क्रिया साम्येनावतिष्ठते इति तस्य तत्पुरुषस्य कर्मधारय इति व्यपदेशः सङ्गत एव। यथा—नीलोत्पलं वर्तते इति। इह हि नीलपदस्य उत्पलदस्य च उत्पलमेव विशेष्यतया अभिधीयमानार्थः। इयांस्तु विशेषः यत् उत्पलपदं उत्पलत्वप्रकारकं बोधयति नीलपदं तु नीलरूपप्रकारकं इति। ततश्च कर्मधारयसमासे विशेषण-पदबोध्यस्य विशेष्यपदबोध्यस्य च अर्थस्य विशेष्यस्य अभिन्नत्वात्, वर्तते इत्येतदर्थे वृत्तौ उत्पलपदार्थस्य कर्तृत्वेनान्वये, नीलपदबोध्यस्याप्यर्थस्य तदभिन्नत्वेन, कर्तृत्वेनैव तत्रैव उत्पल-पदार्थान्वयवत्यां वृत्तिक्रियायां अन्वययोग्यतायाः सत्त्वेन, पूर्वपदार्थस्य उत्तरपदार्थस्य च विषये क्रिया साम्येन अवतिष्ठते इत्यस्य सुवचत्वात्, पूर्वपदार्थस्य उत्तरपदार्थस्य च विषये क्रियां साम्येनावस्थापयतीत्यर्थकः कर्मधारयव्यवहारः अर्थश्रियं नितरां पुष्णाति। इतरेषु "कृष्णश्रितो वर्तते" इत्यादिषु तु पूर्वपदबोध्यस्य उत्तरपदबोध्यस्य च अर्थस्य विशेष्यस्य भिन्नभिन्नत्वात्, कर्मधारये इव एकत्वाभावात्, तयोश्च अर्थयोः श्रितादिपदार्थस्यैव कस्यचित् देवदत्तादेः वृत्यादिक्रियायां कर्तृत्वादिना अन्वयात्, तत्र वृत्त्यादिक्रियायां पूर्वपदीभूतकृष्णादिशब्दार्थस्य (एतादृशतत्पुरुषस्य उत्तरपदार्थप्रधानत्वात्) अप्रधानस्य श्रितादिपदार्थवत् कर्तृत्वादिना अन्वयस्य दुष्प्रतिपादत्वात्, पूर्वपदार्थस्य उत्तरपदार्थस्य च विषये क्रिया साम्येन अवतिष्ठते इति वा, अवस्थातुं अर्हेत् इति वा वक्तुं न शक्यम्। एवञ्च "हरित्रातः" इत्यादिकेऽपि द्वितीयादि-सप्तमीपर्यन्तविभक्त्यन्तपूर्वपदके अन्यत्र च तत्पुरुषे पूर्वपदार्थस्य उत्तरपदार्थस्य च विषये क्रिया साम्येन अवतिष्ठते इत्यस्य वक्तुमशक्यत्वात्, तादृशतत्पुरुषापेक्षया कर्मधारयतत्पुरुषे उक्तविशेषस्य सत्त्वेन तत्र कर्मधारयसंज्ञा युक्ततमैवेति भाति।

बहुव्रीहिः

(१) **'अनेकमन्यपदार्थे'** इत्यनेनायं विधीयते। तत्र प्रथमान्तानामेव बहु-व्रीहिप्रवृत्त्या, **'अन्यपदार्थे'** इत्युक्ते, अन्यपदेन प्रथमाव्यतिरिक्तद्वितीयादिसप्तमीपर्यन्त-विभक्त्यन्तस्य, **यं, येन, यस्मै, यस्मात्, यस्य यस्मिन्** इत्येवं बहोः ग्रहणात्, **बहून्**= द्वितीयादिसप्तमीपर्यन्तविभक्त्यन्तार्थान् अनेकान्, **व्रीयते**=अन्यपदार्थत्वेन वृणोति

इत्यर्थात् बहुव्रीहिपदमन्वर्थमेव । **व्री** वृणोत्यर्थे इति दैवादिकस्य, **हि** प्रत्यये, व्रीहि शब्दः निष्पद्यते ।

(२) **बहवो व्रीहयः यस्य, यत्र वा** इत्येवं, बहुव्रीहिशब्दः किञ्चिद्बहुव्रीहि-समसस्य स्वयमेव प्रतिपादकोऽपि भवति । परन्तु सर्वविधबहुव्रीहिसमासस्य अस्मिन् बहुव्रीहिपदे प्रतिपादनं दुश्शकं प्रत्येयम् ।

द्वन्द्वः

'चार्थे द्वन्द्वः' इतिसूत्रेण इतरेतरयोगे समाहारे च द्वन्द्वसमासो विधीयते । **'अनेकं'** इति बहुव्रीहेः **'अन्यपदार्थे'** इति विधानेन अन्यपदार्थप्राधान्यवत् द्वन्द्वस्य **'चार्थे'** इति विधानेन **चार्थ**प्राधान्यमभीप्सितम् । ततश्च द्वन्द्वे क्वचित् इतरेतरयोगः (साहित्यं) क्वचित् समाहारश्च प्रधानम् । तत्र इतरेतरयोगे साहित्यप्राधान्येऽपि अवयव-सङ्ख्यायाः साहित्ये आरोपात् तदधीनं द्विवचनं बहुवचनं वा भवति । न तु साहित्याधीन-मेकवचनम् । समाहारे तु अवयवसङ्ख्याऽनारोपात समूहस्यैकत्वात् तदधीनं एकवचनमेव भवति । **उभयत्रापि चार्थे** समुदायस्य प्राधान्येऽपि अवयवस्य पूर्वपदार्थस्य उत्तरपदार्थस्य च प्राधान्यं फलत्येवेति **'द्वौ**=पूर्वपदार्थः उत्तरपदार्थश्चेति द्विकं, अभिधीयेते प्राधान्येन इह समासे इत्यर्थकः द्वन्द्वशब्दः सार्थकः ।

द्वन्द्वशब्दश्च **'द्वन्द्वं रहस्यमर्यादावचने'**त्यादि सूत्रे द्वन्द्वं इति योगविभागादन्य-त्रापि द्वन्द्व इति कथनात् द्विशब्दस्य स्वार्थे द्वित्वे, पूर्वस्याम्भावे उत्तरस्यात्त्वे च निष्पद्यते । इदञ्च **'द्वन्द्वं रहस्ये'**तिसूत्रे 'योगविभागादन्यत्रापि द्वन्द्व इष्यते' इति **कौमुदीं** प्रतीकयित्वा, **शेखरे** 'यथा चार्थे द्वन्द्व इति, स्वार्थे द्वित्वं, पुंस्त्वम् लोकात' इति स्पष्ट-मुक्तम् । ततश्च द्वन्द्व इत्युक्ते द्वावित्येवार्थः इति 'प्राधान्येनाभिधीयेते' इति वाक्यशेष माश्रित्य, पूर्वपदार्थः उत्तरपदार्थश्च द्वन्द्वे प्राधान्येनाभिधीयते, उभयपदार्थप्रधानत्वात द्वन्द्वस्य, इत्येवं द्वन्द्वशब्दस्य अन्वर्थत्वं सङ्गच्छते एव ।

नागेशस्तु तत्रैव **शेखरे** उक्तं मूलकृदभिप्रायं प्रदर्श्य, 'अयं योगविभागः भाष्ये न दृश्यते' इत्युपक्रम्य **चार्थेद्वन्द्व** इति तु द्वन्द्वशब्दः अव्युत्पन्नः अवयवार्थाभानात्' इत्येवं प्रतिकूलं स्वाशयमाविष्करोति ।

परन्तु 'केवलं अव्युत्पन्नोयं' इति कथनापेक्षया, 'तत्राशक्यंऽवर्णेनाप्यनर्थकेन **भवितुम्**' इति भाष्यप्रामाण्यात्, सति सम्भवे अन्वर्थत्वकथनस्यैवोचितत्वात् योगविभागे दोषस्य कस्यचिदभावाच्च, तमाश्रित्य अस्य द्वन्द्वशब्दस्य अन्वर्थत्वप्रतिपादनमेव युक्तरूपमाभाति ।

శ్రీరస్తు.

శ్రీతిరుమంగై ఆళ్వార్ల "పెరియ తిరుమడల్"

అను మహాన్వేషణము.

అనువాదకులు: మాడభూషి గోపాలాచార్యులు, బి. ఏ., జిల్లాకోర్టు వకీలు. తిరుపతి.

సీ॥ శ్రీరస్తు! గ్రహతారకా రమ్యసుమదామ సందీప్తమై యొప్పు జలదవేణి!
'తిరుమాలిరుంశోలె', 'తిరుపతు''లననొప్పు వక్షోజములగ్రాలు భూసురాంగి!
రాయంచనడకతో రాజిల్లుభూదేవి! పెక్కుమచ్చలతోడ వెల్గుతలలు
వెయ్యింటిపై నొప్పు వెలలేనిరత్నాల కాంతిపుంజంబులో గ్రాలుచుండు
తే-గీ॥ శేషపర్యంకతలమునఁ జెలువులొలుకు నీలపర్వతంబుననొప్పు నీరజాక్షు
మకరకుండలకాంతి శ్రీమండితమగు తారకామండల వరవితానమందు. 1

సీ॥ స్థిరమగు రవిచంద్ర దీపముల్వెలిగించి జలధితరంగ వింజామరముల
వీచుచుఁదనుమున్ను వేడ్కతోఁగొల్చిన యాత్రివిక్రముఁడైన యాదిదేవు
పాదాబ్జములఁ దన పద్మహస్తంబుతో భావంబుపొంగారఁ బట్టుచుండె
భక్తిపూర్ణతనొప్పు పాదసేవకుఁజొక్కి భోగశాయికిమించె యోగనిద్ర
తే-గీ॥ అంతనానాభివలయమందతిశయించి ఏకరూపమైవిపులమై యెసఁగునొక్క-
సర్వకారణమైనట్టి సరసిజంబు దేవదేవుఁడు పుట్టింపతేజరిల్లె. 2

తే-గీ॥ నాల్గుమోముల దొరపుట్టె నళినమందు
వేదములునాల్గు తొలుదొల్త వెలయఁజేసె
అవియు ధర్మార్థకామంబులనియు మోక్ష
మనియు పురుషార్థములునాల్గె యవునుగాదె! 3

తే-గీ॥ శ్లాఘ్యపథమందు వర్తింప లభ్యములగు వానిలోపల నాల్గవఫలముఁజూడ
మేనువీడిన పిమ్మటఁ గాననగును అద్వితీయంబు ప్రాచీనమైనఫలము 4

తే-గీ॥ పతితఫలముల నతిజీర్ణ పర్ణతతిని గుడిచి పర్ణశాలలఁదూగిమొడలుచిక్కి
వేడివేల్పుని కిరణాలవేడిఁద్రాగి నీటిలోపల స్తంభించి మేటితపము 5

తే-గీ॥ చేసి మైవీడి పైకేగి చెప్పబడిన మోక్షమను ప్రాప్యభూమికి పోవుదురని
వినుటయేగాని యటుజేరియనుభవించి మనకుఁజెప్పంగవినగలమాటకలదె? 6

సీ॥ ఒకవేళమోక్షమే యున్న దేయనుకొన్న నిత్యతీక్ష్ణతతోడ నెగడుచుండు
మార్తాండమండల మధ్యభాగంబున నతిసూక్ష్మరంధ్రంబు నరసిదూరి
ప్రాప్యమామోక్షమౌ పరమపదంబును జేరినవారేరి చెప్పుఁడనఁగ
సరిగచెప్పక తాము శాస్త్రంబువల్లించి చెప్పినమాటలే చెప్పుదురుగ !
తే-గీ॥ జ్ఞానవైరాగ్యశూన్యులీ స్వల్పమతులు తెలియునట్లుగఁ జెప్పంగగలనునేను
ముందుపల్కిన ధర్మాదిమాటిలోన ధర్మమార్గంబు వివరింతుదాని వినుఁడు 7

తే-గీ॥ ధర్మపురుషార్థనిష్ఠలఁ దవులువారు వేయికన్నులవాఁడైన వేల్పువాని
విపులవిఖ్యాతసౌందర్యవిభవమొలుకు పట్టణంబును జొత్తురు ప్రమదమెసఁగ 9

సీ॥ అమరులు గుమిగూడి యానందముగఁజేయు మంగళగీతాళి పొంగిపొరల
ప్రబలారిమర్దనప్రాభవమహితమౌ మృగరాజములుమోయ మెఱయుచున్న
అతిపురాతనమైన యాసనంబులనెక్కి పేర్మిఁగాంతురువారు వేడ్కనపుడు
చురుకువాల్జూపుల తరళకాంతులనీను విబుధకన్యావళి సొబగులొలుక
తే-గీ॥ వీచువింజామరలువీడి విసరుచుండ మందపవనుండు పరిమళమందఁజేయ
స్పర్శసుఖపారవశ్యతవలన మిగుల నతిశయిల్లుచువారట్టులలరుచుండ. 10

తే-గీ॥ మెఱుమువలెఁదోచు నడుముల మించుబోండ్లు
విమల మంజుల సుస్వాంత వివరమధుర
భావగర్భిత దరహాస భాసమాన
రదన నవచంద్రికా సుమప్రకరములను 11
తే-గీ॥ పార్శ్వములనుండి కుఱిపించివర్తిలంగ లేడికన్దోయిసొబగుల లీలలొలుకు
వారి దృగ్జాలసౌందర్య బంధురమగు విభవములఁగ్రోలియావల పేర్మిమెఱయ
తే-గీ॥ ప్రసవమండనరంజిత స్వర్ణకల్ప వృక్షమండలాంతరముల వెలయుచుండు
పూర్ణకుసుమితమందారపుష్పభవ్య నవ్యమకరందములఁజొక్కినాదమొలుకు
తే॥ గీ॥ బంభరాంచిత శృంగారవనలతాంత మాలికాంచిత సౌభాగ్యశ్రీలనెమలి
పురినిబోలిన నెఱిసోగకురులతోడ చలువలొలికెడు కనుదోయి చెలువుతోడ
తే-గీ॥తళుకుమించునుబోలుమధ్యంబుతోడపొలుపుంగొలికెడు నెఱనీటుపువ్వుబోండ్ల
మనసుమెచ్చినరీతుల మంతనములకొక్కెలెసఁగెడిచోట్లఁగూడియాడి. 14

సీ॥ రమణీయమైనట్టి రత్నాలతలముల మాణిక్యమంజరీ మండితమయి
విద్యుత్ప్రభలవోలె విలసిల్లు స్ఫటికంపు శిలలపార్శ్వంబుల వెల్గునవియు
పగడంపుకంబాల భాసిల్లునవియును కనకమయంబౌచు గ్రాలుచుండు
మండపంబులయందు మహిళాలలామలు వరహంసగమనలు సురయువతులు

తే-గీ॥ చిగురుకెంగేలమీటంగ చెలఁగుచుండు భవ్యవీణానినాదముల్ భావమలర
శ్రుతిహితంబుగ వినివిని జొక్కిజొక్కి అతిశయించిన సౌఖ్యంబుననుభవించి

సీ॥ సాంద్రమేఘావళీ సంచార రమ్యంబు విద్యుల్లతాప్రభా విలసితంబు
కమనీయచంద్రికా విమల సంపద్యుక్త చంద్రమండలదీప్తి సన్నుతంబు
విపులంబునై గ్రాలు వినువీథిఁజరియించు వరవిమానములందు తిరములైన
మణిదీపకాంతులు మంజులంబై యొప్పఁ జల్లఁగాఁజూచెదు సరసముఖుల

తే-గీ॥ మెప్పుఁగొనఁజాలి చిత్రమై మెఱయుచున్న విమలపర్యంకతలములవిశ్రమించి
ఆవిమానపార్శ్వంబుల నమరియున్న దట్టమైనట్టి కిటికీలతలుపు తెఱవ 16

తే-గీ॥ అంచపిండుల మెత్తని యడుగుక్రింద నలిగిపొడివైన నీలంపువలపుపూల
ముడుపుశిరమున మెఱయంగ భుజములందు మంజుపరిమళమందారమాలలొప్ప

తే-గీ॥ కల్పభూరుహసుమశయ్యఁగ్రాలుమధుప గణముతను వెంబడించంగ కమ్రగతిని
పరమసుఖదంబు పరిమళబంధురంబు మందపవనంబుజొరబడి సందడించి. 18

తే-గీ॥ తరుణలావణ్యవతులైన తలిరుబోండ్ల లేతచన్దోయి గందంపు పూతలోన
తేమలింకింప దుర్భర తీవ్రతాప తప్తవక్షోజభారంబు తాళలేక. 19

తే-గీ॥ మించుతీవియచందాన సంచలించు చిన్నినడుములపైఁదమచేతులుంచి
యుండునదనున గడునిక్కియొప్పులొలుకు ముగ్ధవక్షోజయుగళిపై మొగ్గలగితి

తే-గీ॥ వెలయుకాంచనహారాళిచలనమందు వారిరుచిరాంగములఁజూచివలఁచివారి
హరిణదృగ్జాలసంజాత పరమసుఖము లనుభవించుచు మందహాసాంచితలగు

తే-గీ॥ వారియధరామృతంబును జూరఁగొనుచు
చెలఁగుచుందురు తమధర్మఫలముగాగ
ధర్మమనియెడు పురుషార్థతత్త్వమిదియ
అర్థపురుషార్థ తత్త్వంబు నరయనిదెగ! 22

తే॥గీ॥ కనుకమేమింకనిలుతుము కామమందె
చారుమృగనేత్రములనొప్పు సరసముఖులు
హంసగమనంబు సిరిగల్గు నలరుబోండ్లు
జనులు నిందింతురనునట్టి శంకవీడి 23

తే-గీ॥ తాటికొమ్మనుజేబూని తమప్రియులకు ప్రాణమర్పించివారికై ప్రణయయాత్ర
సలుపు మర్యాద ద్రావిడశాస్త్రమందు కానబడదను నొకవార్తనేనువింటి 24

తే-గీ॥ అట్టివార్తను నేనెప్పుడాదరింప, సంస్కృతాచార పథమునే సత్కరింతు
అడెయనాది సిద్ధంబు సమంచితంబు దీనినాదరింపనివారి తీరువినుఁడు. 25

సీ॥ మలయజపంకజ పరమసౌభాగ్యంబుఁ బరికింపఁజాలని వారును, మఱి,
గోపాలు పిల్లనగ్రోవి నాకర్ణించి చెదరిపోవనియట్టి మదిగలారు,
గోపులవెన్నాడు కోడెల చిరుగంట రొదలకులొంగని మొదలవారు,
తాటికొమ్మలనీడఁ దమిమీఱవిహరించి మోముమోమునఁజేర్చిపులుఁగుజంట

తే-గీ॥ మెలఁగ మగపక్షినోటిలో మెలఁతపులుఁగు
చేయు చిన్నారియులివులు చెవులునిండ
భర్తృవిరహంబు మదినెంచి పరితపించి
మేను శైథిల్యమొందంగ లేనివారు, 26

తే-గీ॥ విమల నవచంద్రికలనైన పెద్దమంట మింటవెక్కసంబుగఁబర్వమేనుక్రాగి
శిథిలమొందనివారును చెఱకువింట వాడిపూముల్కితగిలించి వలపురేడు 27

తే-గీ॥బలముగాగొట్ట తమిహెచ్చిపరితపించి ప్రియులనెమకంగ వాంఛతోపెద్దవీధి,
బ్రణయయాత్రకుఁ జొరనట్టివారుగాదె నంస్కృతాచారసరణిని సరకుగొనరు

అ-వె॥ అపుడె సిరియువిరుల నందంపుకొప్పుల, జఘనములను, చిన్నిచన్నుగవను
పిల్లగాలితడవ చల్లఁగాపూవుల పాన్పులందుతూగు స్వర్ణలతలు 29

అ-వె॥ తాటికొమ్మఁబూని తమనాథులనుజేర ప్రణయయాత్రఁజేయు భవ్యమైన
విరహాసంపదలను వేవేగఁదాము పూర్ణసిద్ధివెలయఁ బొందవలయు. 30

సీ॥ తరతరంబుగవచ్చితనకుగావేచిన - పృథులరాజ్యంబును విసరివైచి,
నగరవాసులరోదనంబులనెంచక - శిథిలంబుగానట్టిచేవతోడ

పితరుని యాజ్ఞను ప్రేమతోఁ దలనిడి - రణరంగ వీరుండు రామవిభుఁడు
మెఱుములవలె మిన్కు మృగతృష్ణలనునిండి - భయదమైగన్పట్టు వనమునందు

తే-గీ॥ శిలలపయి మయి కార్చిచ్చుచేత చీల్పఁ-బడిన వెదురుగుములతోడఁ బరగుచోట్ల
సుళ్ళపడి గాలివీవంగ సుక్కనట్టి-కడుపుగల దయ్యములగుంపు కదలునెడలఁ 31

తే-గీ॥ బోవఁదను వెంబడించుచు పుష్పబోణి హంసగామిని వైదేహి యతని దేవి
సూర్యకిరణాలఁ గడుఁ గ్రాగి సుక్కఁజేయు రాళ్ళపై పూలయడుగిడి వెళ్ళలేదె! 32

చ॥ అసితములాయతంబులును నందములౌ హరిణేక్షణంబులున్
పసిడి మెఱుంగు తీగవలె భాసిలు సొంపగు సూక్ష్మమధ్యమున్
మిసమిసలాడు కెంపువలె మిక్కిలియొప్పఁగఁ బొల్చుమోవియున్
పసితనమొల్క వేగవతి ప్రాణసమానుని చిత్తచోరునిన్ 33

చ॥ కనుఁగొనలేక వానికయి కన్నియయొంటిగ నేగుచుండఁగాఁ
దనమునుపుట్టువౌనతఁడు ధర్మముకాదని యడ్డగింప, నా
తని నిరసించి పోరుమొనఁ దద్దయుఁ బొల్చెడు బల్లిదున్ వరున్
ఘనభుజుఁ జూచి చై కలసి కౌఁగిటఁ జేర్పదె కాంచనాంగునిన్. 34

ఉ॥ రాలిన పూలతో మిగులరంజిలు గంగ చరించు దేశమున్
ఏలెడువాఁడు, మించువలె నెంతయు మిన్కెడు వాడిబల్లెమున్
కేలధరించు కౌరవులకీర్తికరుండు, కులప్రధానుఁడున్
పోలికకీడుఁ దాగసని పూర్ణజయాంకుఁడు శ్రీధనంజయున్. 35

ఉ॥ పన్నగరాజుకూతురగు భవ్యతఁ గల్గినకన్నె, కన్నెకున్
వన్నియఁగూర్చు సిగ్గువిడి, భవ్యతవీడి, భయంబుమాని తాఁ
గ్రన్ననఁ జేరి చన్మొనలు కౌఁగిట బంధమునందు నల్గఁగాఁ
గ్రొన్నన విల్తుకేళికలఁ గూడిన సత్కథవిన్నదే కదా! 36

సీ॥ వలగొను జలధిలోపరలిన సౌవర్ణ నగరంబుఁ గూల్చిన నగరిపునకు
సకలవిధంబుల సమమైనవాఁడును నసురాధినాథుఁడు నైన బాణు
వరపుత్రి, కన్నియ, నిరుపమసౌందర్య వతియైన యుషయను పద్మగంధి
తనప్రాణ సఖియైన తన్వి తంత్రంబున, తుళసిమాలలతోడ వెలయువాని

తే-గీ॥ రత్నగిరిబోలు భుజముల ప్రభలవాని; పాపినన్నిట్టిగతికీడ్చి వరలువిభుని
నాల్గుభుజములనొప్పారు నాదుసామి కృష్ణపౌత్రు ననఘుని కీర్తిపరుని. 37

తే-గీ॥ చిన్నవానిని ననిరుద్ధుఁగన్నెయయ్యు
మాయచేఁదీసికొనిపోయి మహిమవెలయఁ
బ్రక్కనిడుకొని తుదలేని పరమసుఖము
లనుభవించెను వానితో నదియుఁగాక; 38

తే-గీ॥ ఇట్టివృత్తాంతముల మీరలిపుడె నేను పలుకవిన్నారె యోపేదబాలలార!
ఇంక నేనేమివచియింతు నింతకన్న నైన నుడివెదవినుఁడీర లాదరమున- 39

చ॥ వెలుఁగు మెఱుంగు వెన్నెలల - పెంపులనీనెడు దంతపంక్తియున్
పొలుపగు కావిమోవియును - పొంకములొల్కెడు హంసయానమున్
చెలువగు దివ్యరూపమును - జేరివెలందిగనొప్పుకన్నె, యా
వలిమల ముద్దుపట్టి, సతి - పార్వతి సత్కథ మీరువింటిరే! 40

సీ॥ అసియాడు నడుముతో నందంబుగానొప్పు బంగారునెమ్మేను బడలివాడ,
పంచేంద్రియంబులు పట్లువీడి తొలంగ సన్నుతకేశాళి జడగటీర,
తపియించి తపముండి తపసుముగింపున కౌఁగిటఁజేర్చెదే కాంతు నాథు,
ముద్దుగుల్కనటించు మోహనాకారుని భయదశూలంబుతో వరలువాని
తే-గీ॥ భస్మమొడలెల్లధరియించి వరలువాని రుద్రనామంబుతోవెల్గు భద్రకరుని
బాహువులు వెయ్యిదిక్తట వ్యాప్తిఁగాంచి జ్వాల లెగయంగ, విసరుచుజాపినట్టి
తే-గీ॥ కటకభూషిత శ్రీపాదకమలమేదు లోకములదాటి పెల్లుగ నాకమడల
వాయునక్షత్రకులనగ ప్రతతితన్నుఁ జుట్టితిరుగంగ నర్తించు సొంపువాని. 42

చ॥ వెలయగ నీకథల్ మిగుల పెంచివచించుట, యిష్టసిద్ధినిఁ
గలుగఁగఁజేయనట్టి యఘకాండముచేఁ గడుకుందుచుండు నా
కలవడనట్టి భారతమవన్నిఁటిఁ జెప్పగనేల? మాని, నే
బలికెదఁగాక, నేఁబడిన బాధల మీరలు విందురిప్పుడే! 43

ఉ॥ చుట్టును దోటలన్గలిగి సొంపులనింపుచు, వైదికాళికిఁ
బట్టగు "శ్రీనెల్లై" యనెడు పట్టణమందతి దివ్యదీప్తితో

గట్టునుబోలి యొల్లప్పుడుఁగ్రాలెడుమంఠప రాజమందు, నే
నట్టులె చూచినిల్చితి ననంతప్రమోదిత నేత్రయుగ్మనై. 44

సీ॥ ప్రభువైననాస్వామి వక్షస్థలంబును - అరుణాధరంబును సదుగుజంట
చెన్నొల్కు కెంగేలు చెలువారుకనుదోయి, నీలంపుమలయందు నీలెసంగు
స్వర్ణపంకజరాశిప్రభలు నావెల్గెడు - కటిసూత్రమును రెట్టకడియములును
మకరకుండలహార మణికిరీటంబులున్ స్థిరదివ్యదీప్తుల వరలఁజేయ
ఆ-వె॥ మహితకాంతితోడ మరకత గిరిలీల వెలుఁగువానిచెంత నిలిచియుండె
పరమ లలితమైన బాలవంజుళలత ఉపమలేని యొప్పులొల్కులతిక ! 45

చ॥ అదియొకహంసమై హరిణమై యొకదివ్య మయూరరాజమై
పొదలెను దానిమధ్యన నపూర్వతటిత్ప్రభ, బాలవంశముల్,
చెదరెడు తళ్కుబేడిసలు, శ్రీకలశద్వయి, బింబరాజమున్
విదితములై విలాసముగ వెల్గుచునుండెను దివ్యదీప్తితోన్. 46

చ॥ నిలిచిన యట్టిరూపమును నేగనవైతిని నామనస్సునన్
తలపును, గాజులున్ దొలఁగె తానుగనాఁమొలనూలు జారె, హా !
అలలఁదిరంబుగా నెగచు నాజలరాశియుమ్రోగె మెండుగా!
సలలిత సాంద్రచంద్రికలు సాగెను వేచఁగ వేడివెల్లులై . 47

చ॥ ఇలగల వస్తుజాలముల వేలిటునై జగుణంబు మానుటో
మలయజచందన ప్రసవ మంజుళబాల సమీరమెప్పుడున్
నిలిచెడు నీజగత్తునకు నిశ్చలసౌఖ్యమొసంగి వీచుచున్
దలపడి నాపయున్నిటుల తప్పనినిప్పుల కుప్పపోయునే! 48

చ॥ అదె, అదె, తాళవృక్షమున నాకనిపించెడు గూటిలోపలన్
పొదలెడు పుల్గుజంటఁగను! పొంకముగా మగదాని నోటిలో
ముదమున నాలిపుల్గు తన ముద్దులొసంగెడు ముద్దుకూత, నా
మదినొక అంపకోతవలె మానకకోయు నికెట్టులోర్తునో! 49

చ॥ శిలవలెగట్టిరెట్టగల శ్రీసుతుఁడిక్షు ధనుస్సువంచి, నే
గలగెడు రీతిఫేనుడులఁగాటెయఁబెట్టుచుఁ బువ్వుటమ్ములన్

చెలఁగుచుఁగూర్చి యొంటియగు చేడియ నామెయిదూర, రెట్టకున్
వలనుగలాగి నామదిని వానికి లక్ష్యముచేసి యేసెడిన్. 50

సీ॥ ఇటువంటి వెతనుండి యెవ్వారు నన్నింకఁ గాపాడఁగలవారొ కానరారు
చపలచిత్తనునైతి సాంద్రశిలామయమైన యొకానొక కాననమున
అలరు తీవియయందు నపుడప్డెపూచిన వరపుష్పసంజాత పరిమళంబు
అనుభవార్హముగాక యామహావనములో లీనమైపోయెడి రీతిగాదె! 51
తే-గీ॥ నాదుకామినీత్వంబును నాసుగుణము నాదువక్షోజయుగళంబు నాసొగసును
కర్ణపురియందు బంగారుగట్టులీల వెలయు లక్ష్మీశు నురమందుఁగలయుకన్న!

ఉ॥ నా మెయి యందచందములు నావలిగుబ్బల మేటియందమున్
దా మతిభార మాత్రము లుదారతమీఱఁగ నన్నుగావగా
నేమెయియైన శక్తిగల దేదొకసిద్ధిక కౌషధంబునున్
ప్రేమయెసంగ నివ్వగల పెద్దలులేర! యికేమొనర్తునో! 52

సీ॥ బాలలదృష్టికి భయదమై దృఢమైన శృంఖలాబద్ధ సంశ్రీలతోడ
వ్యామోహితంబులై యల్లాడువృషభరాజంబుల మిక్కిలిచక్కనైన
మూపురంబులతోడఁ బొలుపారు మెడలపై వెలయుచురాత్రులనిలువకుండ
సలలితారవముతో గలగలమనిమ్రోగు చిరుగంటలోఁబుట్టి చెలఁగుమ్రోత 53
తే-గీ॥ శ్రవణరంధ్రంబులోదూరి సంతతంబు వాడియైనట్టిశూలంబు వలెనెతాకి
నన్నుబాధించుచున్నది చెన్నమీఱ నన్నురక్షించునొకత్రోవయున్నఁజెపుడ

సీ॥ కమ్మనితుళసితోఁ గ్రాలువక్షమువాఁడు, విరహులవధయందు విక్రముఁడగు
చంద్రుఁగాపాడిన జలదాభవర్ణుండు - వలపుపుష్పాడిరేకు పోలుపులోల్కు-
అతసీసుమశ్రీల నలరువన్నియవాఁడు - సమవర్ణముననొప్పు సంద్రమందు
పర్వతంబులఁద్రోసి వంతెనబంధించి - రణమందు రాజైన రావణుపది 54
తే-గీ॥ అందమైనట్టి తలలను నవనిపైన - వ్రాలునట్లుగశరములవరలఁజేసి
యముని వీటికిఁబంపిన యతఁడెనేడు - నన్నునీరీతి హింసించుచున్నవాఁడు.

సీ॥ వేల్పులరేఁడైన వేయికన్నులవాని - లోకమున్ విబుధుల లోకములను
తనబాహుబలముచేఁబనివడిగైకొన్న కనక కశ్యపుడను-దనుజపతిని

హరిరూపమునుదాల్చి యగ్గిచూడ్కులఁజూఁచి - రణమందుజంపకరమణతనర
బల్లిదుముడిఁబట్టి ప్రక్కఁజేరగనీడ్చి - వానితన్గాళ్లపైఁ బండఁబెట్టి, 55

తే-గీ॥ వానిబంగారు నెమ్మేని వాడిగోళ్ల - జీల్చి పేరుఁగాంచినయట్టి శ్రీహరియగు
భాస్వదురు చక్రహస్తుండువాఁడె,వాఁడె-నన్ను నీరీతి హింసించుచున్న వాఁడు.

మధ్యాక్కర :— 56

ప్రళయార్ణవంబుచే మ్రింగ - బడిన యాధారుణిఁ గావ
విలయజలంబులో వేగ - భీకరదంష్ట్రియైయున్ని
తళతళ మెఱయు క్రొవ్వాడి - దంష్ట్రాగ్రమున భూమిఁజేర్చి
యలతిగా రక్షించినట్టి - యద్భుత సంచారపరుని

తరువోజ :— 57

తీరముగా నుత్తరదిక్కులోవెలయు - ఘనమందరంబొకకవ్వంబుగాఁగ
పరమతేజంబుతో వరలు వాసుకియు - కవ్వంబు త్రాడుగా గ్రాలుచునుండ
నిరతదీప్తులతోడ నింగిలోవెలుగు - మేటిజోతులు రెండు మెఱయంగదివియు
వరలుతారలతోడ భాసురలీల - బిరబిర తిరుగంగ వేగఁద్రిప్పించి
అరుదైన యమృతంబు నమరులచేత - పానంబుజేయించి వారిదుఃఖముల
తిరముగాఁబోగొట్టి దివ్యాత్మఘనతఁ - ప్రేమస్వరూపుఁడై వెలసినవాని
పరమవీరులకెల్ల వరుఁడైన చక్ర-వర్తి మహాబలివర యజ్ఞమందు
కరమొప్పు తనరూప గాంభీర్యములను - వామనమూర్తిలోవలనొప్పదాచి 58

చ॥ అసదృశబ్రహ్మచారియయి యాబలిచిత్తమురంజిలన్ గదున్
పసగల వాక్యజాలముల వంచనచేయుచు మూడుపాదముల్
కొసరుచు భూమివేడ, బలి 'కోరినభూమి నొసంగితిన్' అనన్
వెసఁదనరత్నశీర్షకము వీకను నింగిని దాఁటచుఁడగా 59

తే-గీ॥ వీరమంజీరరవముతో వెలయుచున్న దివ్యసౌందర్యభూయిష్ట దీప్తమైన
ఉత్ప్రిచాలిత శ్రీపాదయుగళితోడ సప్తలోకంబులనుగప్పి శాత్రవులను 60

తే-గీ॥ చెదరఁగొట్టుచు తిరమైన శ్రీలఁజెలగు
ధరణిఁగైకొన్న యడుగులఁ దనరువాని

మెఱుమువలె మిన్కు-నడుముతో మిన్కుతమ్మి
యింటి జవరాలిమగఁడైన యింపువాని 61

సీ॥ "తిరువిణ్ణకరి" లోన దివ్యకాంచనగిరి - వలెచాలవెల్గుచు చెలఁగువాని
కావేరిమణులతో గ్రాలు "తిరుక్కొ-డం - దె" నగరియా రణధీరవరు "తి
రుక్కు-అంగడి"లోని రుక్మప్రవాళాద్రిఁ - జల్లనిచేతెలో సంతతంబు
వాసంబుచేయుచు వరలు నాపరముని - పంకజదళశయ్య పవ్వళించు 62

తే-గీ॥ పరమహంసావళీయుక్తవారిపూర్ణ-బహుళ సుక్షేత్రవలయిత 'వాలి' నగర
వాసి నాకూర్మియమృతమైవరలువాని-'ఎవ్వళ'నుచోట గిరిలీల నెసఁగువాని

తే-గీ॥ నవ్యప్రాకార మండల దివ్యదీప్తి వరలు 'కణమంగె' నగరిలో కోరలుతీర్చు
కల్పవృక్షంబులీలను గ్రాలువాని మించుతీవియ చందాన మెఱయులక్ష్మిఁ 63

తే-గీ॥ గూడి శంఖచక్రంబులతోడ వెల్గు
వాని, 'వెళ్ళైత్తె' రత్న దేవాలయమున
వెల్గు నా స్వర్ణమయుఁడైన పేర్మివాని
మరకత మయుఁడై 'పుట్కు-ళ్ళి' వరలు శూరు 64

తే-గీ॥ నిత్యవాసియై శ్రీరంగ నిలయమందు
మాకు సులభుఁడై వర్తిల్లు మహితమణిని
'వల్లివాళ్' నీల మగఁడుగా వరలువాని
నన్ను మోహించి 'ఇడవన్దై' నున్న యీశు 65

తే-గీ॥ అభవుఁడై 'ప్పేరి' లో వెల్గు నట్టివాని
ప్రళయవారి శయానుఁడై రంధ్రరహిత
స్వచ్ఛరత్నంబువలెఁ గ్రాలు భాసురాంగు
నన్ను మోహించి నిల్చిన సన్నుతాత్ము 66

తే-గీ॥ 'తిరువిడన్దై'కు స్వామియై వరలువాని, తిరముగా'కడల్ మల్లై'లో బరగువాని
నిత్యసూరి శిరోరత్న నిత్యతేజు దివ్య 'తణ్గాలి' లో వెల్గు ధీబలాఢ్యు 67

తే-గీ॥ పరులమెఱుకకు నందంగ వలనుపడని తత్త్వమైముత్యమైయొప్పు-సత్త్వమౌముని
హంసయై మీనమై హరియైనవాని, కఠినవేదార్థవేద్యుఁడై గ్రాలువాని 68

తే-గీ॥ ప్రళయకాలంబునన్ మున్ను రహితలిర్ప సర్వమును మ్రింగి వెలసినసకలభోక్త
'కోవలూరి'నాయాశ్చర్యగుణగణాఢ్యు అఱచుపూతన చనుగ్రోలినట్టివాని

తే-గీ॥ అడుసుమల్లలోఁదమతిండి నరయుచుండు హంసపిండులతోఁజాలనందమైన
'తిరువళ్ళున్దూరి' యుజ్జ్వల దివ్యతేజు 'చిత్రకూట'స్థుఁడైన నా సిరులవాని 70

తే-గీ॥ మెఱుము గుమిఁగూడి మబ్బులమెఱయుచున్న
వెంకటాద్రిని వసియించు విభు నతీతు
శత్రు భీకర చక్రంబుఁ జక్కఁబట్టి
'మాలిరుంశోలై' లోవెల్గు మాప్రియు, వరు 71

తే-గీ॥ అతిశయించినసౌందర్య మావహిల్ల ఆ'తిరుకోట్టి' యూరిలో నలరుహరిని
పరమభోగ్యామృతలహరి భాతిసతము అచట 'తిరుమెయ్యి'లో వెల్గునట్టివాని,

తే-గీ॥ 'ఇన్దళూర'ను వేంచేసి యింపుగులుకు పరమపావనమూర్తియై వరలువాని,
వప్రవలయిత 'కాంచికా'పట్ణమందు చెలఁగు 'వేళుక్కై'లో నరసింహమూర్తి

తే-గీ॥ 'ప్పాడ'కములోని నాచిన్ని వయసువాని, యోగనిద్రను'వెఃకావి'నున్నవాని
'ఊరకము'లోన మిక్కిలి యొప్పువాని 'అష్టభుజ' శౌరి నాహృదయాపహారి

తే-గీ॥నిత్యసూరుల కగ్రుఁడై నెగడువాని, అతని'మూళిక్కళము'లోననతిశయించి
దివ్వెవలెవెల్గుచుండెడు దీప్తతేజు 'ఆతనూరి'యాకాల నియామక విభు 75

తే-గీ॥ నిన్న నేడును రేపునై నెగడువాని 'నీర్మలై'లోని నిత్యుఁడౌ నిగమపురుషు
ద్రవిడ వేదస్వరూపుఁడై దక్షిణమున వెలయు 'పుల్లాణి'లో నెప్డు చెలఁగువాని

తే-గీ॥ సంస్కృతామ్నాయమూర్తి నాస్వామి నీశు
మహిత 'నాఙ్గూరి' తిరుమణి మాడమందు
ఆలయంబునుగైకొన్న యందగాని
విమల జలపూర్ణ సౌభాగ్య విశదమైన 77

తే-గీ॥ తలము 'తిరుతలై చెంగాడు' దానిలోన
విమలరాకా శశాంకుఁడై వెలయువాని,
అస్మదీయాశ్రయ స్థానియా అల 'తిరు
కణ్ణపురి' లోన కృష్ణుఁడై గ్రాలువాని 78

తే-గీ॥ 'తెన్నతైయూరు'అను దివ్యదేశమందు
రత్నమంత పాలయమందు రహినిబొల్చు
వివిధకల్యాణ గుణముల వెల్గు వరుని
ప్రబల దార్ఢ్యంబుగల బాహుబలమువాని 79

తే-గీ॥ కాంచి కేల్మోడ్చి నాస్థితిగతులనెల్ల నంచితంబుగ వివరించినంత స్వామి
తనదు కృపతోడ తిరుమేనిదాన మొసగి నన్ను ప్రియమార నేలకయున్న వినుఁడు

తే-గీ॥ మించువలెమిన్కు నడుముల మించుబోండ్ల
వసతులందును వైదీకవరుల యెడల,
భక్తులుండెడి చోట్లను వరకృపాణ
పాణులై ధరనేలు నా ప్రభువులెడుట 81

తే-గీ॥ ఇచ్చటచ్చట ననయేల నెల్లయెడల వాని చరితప్రకారముల్ పలువిధముల
నిరవశేషంబుగానేను నిశ్చయముగ తేటతెల్లంబుగాజేసి తిరుగుచుండు 82

సీ॥ వరతటిల్లతలీల వరలు నెన్నడుముల విరిబోండ్లతోనిండి వెలయుచుండు
గోకులంబున మున్ను గొల్లయిండ్లనుపొంచి తడికెల దిగద్రోసి వడిగదూరి
దధి నవనీతముల్ తనివారభక్షింప తళుకుబేడిసకంటి తలిరుబోండ్ల
చేఁబట్టుబడి త్రాటిచే రోలునకుఁగట్ట బడినట్టి తనపూర్వ ప్రాభవంబు
ఆ-వె॥ గొల్లలుత్సవమున గొప్పబండ్లను నింపి తెచ్చిపోసినట్టి దివ్యమైన
అన్నరాశినంత నందరిముందుగా బొజ్జనిండతిన్న లజ్జలేమి 83

సీ॥ పరమ సుఖార్థులౌ పాండుపుత్రులదూత యైమహాసభదూరి యచటఁదాను
వారినిందలకెల్ల పాత్రుఁడై నట్టియా రాయభారముయొక్క రమ్యతయును
తరుణీమణులయొక్క తరళనేత్రంబుల నానంద ముప్పొంగి యలరునట్లు
తప్పెటమ్రోగించి యుప్పొంగి విరహుల బాధించు నృత్యంబు వరలఁజేసి
తే-గీ॥ కుంభనృత్యంబు నాపైన గోరిచేసి ఏలయీతఁడీ నృత్యంబు నిట్లుజేయు
ననుచు జనములు తనుజూచి యాడునట్లు తానుపడినట్టి నర్తన దైన్యవిధిని 84

సీ॥ దక్షిణదిక్కులోఁ దనరారులంకకు - స్వామినియైనట్టి వనిత, దైత్య
కులమణిదశముఖు కూర్మిసోదరియును - క్రకరదంతంబుతో గ్రాలు పడతి
శత్రుభీకరమైన సహజకోపగుణాఢ్య - శూర్పనఖాఖ్యమున్నార్పలేని
కామశైథల్యయై ప్రేమతోఁదనువేఁడ - ముక్కుకోసినయట్టి పూర్ణబలిమి
తే-గీ॥ పర్వతోపమకాయ యాపడతియైన - తాటకినిదాను మునికిగా దక్షిణేశు
పీటికంపిన తనశౌర్యధాటియు మఱి - యిట్టిచర్యల నెన్నియో యేలనాడ! 85

చ॥ మొలకగలేచి పెంపుగని పొంకములొల్కగ వ్యాప్తిగాంచుచున్
చెలఁగుచు సుందరంబులగు శ్రీలఁదనర్చెడు తాటికొమ్మరున్
సలలిత సాధనంబుగను జక్కగ హస్తమునందు దాల్చినే
నలతిగ సంచరించెదను నందరు కన్నులు విప్పిచూడగాన్. 86

సర్వము సంపూర్ణము. శ్రీ శ్రీ శ్రీ.

సమూర్తయజనము - వైఖానస శాస్త్రము

ఆర్. పార్థసారథి అయ్యంగార్

శ్రీవైఖానస సూత్ర శాస్త్రముల రచనాకాలమును గురించి ముందటి వ్యాసమందు ప్రస్తావింపబడినది. ఈరచనాకాలము వైదికుల సంప్రదాయము ననుసరించి యతిప్రాచీనమైనదనియు బౌధాయనాది సూత్రము లన్నింటికంటెను ప్రాచీనమైనదనియు పాశ్చాత్య పరిశోధకుల నిర్ణయము ననుసరించి క్రీస్తు తరువాత 2 లేక 3 శతాబ్దముల నాటిదై యుండుననియు నావ్యాసమందు నిరూపింపబడి యున్నది.

సూత్రమందు సంక్షేపముగ చెప్పబడి భగవచ్ఛాస్త్రములందు వ్యాఖ్యానింపబడినట్టి సమూర్తయజనము నేటికాలపు విశాల మానవకోటి యందంతటను స్ఫార ప్రచారమునందుండినట్లే అనాద్యనంతమగు కాలమందు పూర్వమందును నిట్లేయుండియుండెనను నంశము ఏ యేయాకరములందెచ్చటెచ్చట ఏ యేరూపమున నున్నదో యిప్పుడు విచారింపబడుచున్నది. వైఖానస భగవచ్ఛాస్త్రము సమూర్తయజనము నైదంపర్యముగ బోధించుటవలనను నిర్దిష్ట ప్రణాళికతోడ నారంభింపబడిన యీవ్యాస పరంపరయందు వైఖానస పంచరాత్రముల స్వరూప నిరూపణమును వ్రాయు సందర్భములో ‘ వైఖానసం పంచరాత్రం వైదికం తాంత్రికం క్రమాత్’ ఇత్యాది ప్రమాణములందలి వైదికశబ్దార్థ నిర్ణయమునం దుపయుక్తమగుటచేతను నీ సమూర్తయజనమును వ్రాయుట ప్రస్తుతమైనది.

‘ వాచా విరూపనిత్యయా ’ ‘ అనాదినిధనా హ్యేషా వాగుత్సృష్టా స్వయంభువా ’ ఇత్యాది ప్రమాణములచే వేదమనాదినిధనమైనది. పరమేశ్వరునివలె స్వయంభువైనదియునై యున్నది అని వైదికులు నమ్ముచున్నారు. ఐనను పరిశోధకులు చారిత్రకములగు నాధారాభాసములను తీసికొని వేదోదితమగు సృష్టిక్రమమును ధర్మములను తారుమారుగ సమన్వయించి వేదము నార్యులు రచించిరనియు దాని రచనాకాలము ఇప్పటికి సుమారు యేడు యెనిమిదివేల సంవత్సరములకు పూర్వమైయుండవచ్చుననియు చెప్పుచున్నారు.

మనము నివసించెడి భూగోళము పూర్వ మొకప్పుడు సూర్యమండలమువలె యగ్నిగోళముగనే యుండెననియు కాలక్రమమున నందలి యౌష్ణ్యము చల్లబడి యందు తృణగుల్మలతాదులుత్పన్నమగు నవకాశమేర్పడి క్రమముగ ప్రతిబుద్ధ ప్రాణులగు మృగములు అందుండి మనుష్యులును యిట్లు సృష్టిక్రమమును కల్గిరనియు వారు చెప్పుదురు. చల్లబడుట కారంభమైన నాటినుండియు క్రమముగ నిప్పటికిని యట్టి పరిణామము జరుగుచునే యుండినదనియును దీనికికారణము ప్రకృతియే యనియు వారనుచున్నారు.

ఈశ్వరుడు, జీవుడు ప్రకృతియునని నిత్యపదార్థములను మూడింటిని వైదికులు చెప్పుదురు. ఈశ్వరుడొక్కడు ఆతడు నియంత స్వతంత్రుడు. జీవుల సంఖ్యాతములు, పరతంత్రులు. ప్రకృతియు ననంతము, అచేతనము, అస్వతంత్రము. సృష్టిప్రళయము లొకదానినొకటి యనువర్తించుచున్నవి. వేదముల పౌరుషేయములు నిత్యములు ఈశ్వరాజ్ఞారూపములు. చతుర్ముఖుడు సృష్టిని రుద్రుడు సంహారమును వేదములను ముందిడుకొని చేయుదురు. వేదములు భగవదారాధనమును విధించుచున్నవి. అగ్నీంద్రాదులం దంతర్యామియగు నీశ్వరు నారాధించుటకు యజ్ఞములు విధింపబడినవి. ఈయజ్ఞము లగ్నియందు హవిస్సును హోమముచేయుటచే నిర్వర్తింపబడును. ఈవిధాన మమూర్తయజన మనబడుచున్నది. అగ్నీంద్రాద్యంతర్యామియగు నీశ్వరుడు యజ్ఞఫలప్రదాతయైయున్నాడు. అట్లే సాక్షాత్తుగ నీశ్వరుని యారాధనము తత్ప్రీతికృతి యగు విగ్రహమందు చేయుటయు వేదములందే చెప్పబడినది. ఈ విధానము సమూర్తయజన మనబడుచున్నది. సమూర్తయజనమునకనువగు విగ్రహముగ శిలాదులచే భగవత్స్వరూపకల్పనము, తదారాధనప్రకారము, ఆరాధనఫలశ్రుతియు వేదములందు చెప్పబడినది.

ఋగ్వేదమందు 'ప్ర వః పాన్తమన్ధసో ధియాయతే మహేశూరాయ విష్ణవే చార్చత । యా సానుని పర్వతానామదాభ్యా మహస్తస్థతురర్వతేవ సాధునా' (మండలం 1-సూ 155. మంత్రం 1.=అష్టకం 2. 2. 25.) యని యొక ఋక్కు పఠింపబడి 'శౌనకోఽహం ప్రవక్ష్యామి నిత్యం విష్ణ్వర్చనం పరమ్। ప్ర వః పాన్తమన్ధస ఇత్యర్ధర్చవిధానతః' యని ఋగ్విధానమందు దీని వినియోగముకూడ చెప్పబడినది. దీనియర్థ మిట్లు సంగ్రహింపవచ్చును. ఓ యధ్వర్యులారా మిమ్ములను కంటికి

రెప్పవలె కాచుచుండిన శ్రీమహావిష్ణుని యర్చనమును మీదేహయాత్రకువలయు నైహిక సౌఖ్యవృద్ధికిని ముక్తినిజెందుటకు వలయు బుద్ధికొరకును మీరాచరించుడు. ఆదేవుడు మహాశూరుడు. పర్వత సానువులందు నివసించువాడు. వాని నాశ్రయించిన మోక్షముగల్గును.

శ్రీవిద్యారణ్య మాధవాచార్యులువారు వేదభాష్య వ్యాఖ్యానము చేయునప్పుడు మహేశూరాయ శబ్దమునకు ఇంద్రుడర్థమని చెప్పుచు, యా అదాభ్యా తస్థతుః అను ద్వివచనాంత స్వారస్యముచేత విష్ణుశబ్దమును ఇంద్ర శబ్దముతోచేర్చి అంధశ్శబ్దమునకు సోమరూపమగు నన్నమను నర్థముచెప్పి యర్చత శబ్దమునకు సేకరించుట యని యర్థము చేసియున్నారు. దీనికంటె శౌనకుని యభిప్రాయము ననుసరించి ముందుటి యర్థమును చెప్పుటలో యర్చతశబ్దమున కర్థము సుసంగతము కాగలదు. ఈ ఋక్కు నొక్క యర్థమును నాచ్చియార్ కోవిల్ శ్రీకృష్ణభట్టాచార్యులువారిట్లు వివరించియున్నారు. ప్రవః పాన్తమితి. ప్రవః ప్రాన్తమితి పంచర్చం షోడశం సూక్తమ్. దీర్ఘతమా ఋషిః ఆద్యాస్తిస్రః ఐంద్రావైష్ణవ్యః ద్వితీయతృచస్య విష్ణుర్దేవతా ఛందో జగతీ, ప్రవః పాన్తం అన్ధసః ధియాయతే మహే శూరాయ విష్ణవే చ అర్చత యా సానుని పర్వతానాం అదాభ్యా మహాః తస్థతుః అర్వతా ఇవ సాధునా ఇతి పదపాఠః. హే భగవదర్చకాః యజమానస్యాపి అర్చక కోటౌ ప్రవేశః తస్యాపి పూజకద్వారా అర్చకత్వాత్ వః యుష్మాకం సంబన్ధి పాన్తం పాతవ్యం ద్రవద్రవ్యరూప మర్ఘ్యం అన్ధసః కఠినద్రవ్యరూపాణి హవీంషి చ ధియాయతే అర్చనఫలరూప మపరోక్ష సాక్షాత్కారమిచ్ఛతే అర్చనఫలరూపతయా స్వాపరోక్ష సాక్షాత్కార మర్చకాదీనాం యజమానాదీనాం దాతుమిచ్ఛత ఇత్యర్థః ఏతేన నిష్కామవిష్ణ్వర్చనఫలం మోక్షావ్యవహితోపాయభూతదర్శన శబ్దిత భగవదపరోక్షసాక్షాత్కార ఇత్యుక్తం భవతి. ఇమమర్థం సంగిరతే భగవానఙ్గిరా మరీచిశబ్దితో విమానార్చనాకల్పే జ్ఞానకాండే. 'తదారాధనేన సంసారార్ణవనిమగ్నో జీవాత్మా పరమాత్మానం నారాయణం పశ్య'తీతి మహే తేజస్వినే శూరాయ శత్రునిరసన సమర్థాయ విష్ణవే తన్నామకాయ దేవాయ, చ అనేన అనుక్తఇన్ద్రస్సముచ్చీయతే. ప్రకర్షేణ అర్చత పూజయత 'అర్చ పూజాయామ్' 'ప్ర' ఇత్యస్య 'వ్యవహితాశ్చే'తి సూత్రాదర్చతేత్యనేనాన్వయః. యద్వా మహే ఉత్సవే మహస్తూత్సవతేజసో రిత్యమరః,

మహాశబ్దస్య తేజః పరత్వే అదన్తత్వం జీ ప్రత్యయాన్తత్వం చ ఛాందస మితి భావ్యమ్. చ కారేణ ఇంద్ర ఏవ గ్రాహ్యః. అస్యా ఋచ ఐన్ద్రావైష్ణవత్వాత్ ఏవం చ పూజాప్రధానభూతద్రవ్యాభ్యామర్ఘ్యహవిర్భ్యాం జ్ఞానాది సమస్తఫల ప్రదం ఫలప్రతిబంధకసమస్తకర్మాభిభవపరం ఫలసాధనీభూతార్చన ప్రతిబన్ధక నిఖిలకర్మ నిబర్హణసమర్థం విష్ణుం ప్రకర్షేణ అర్చత జ్ఞానభక్త్యాది విశిష్టధర్మపుర స్సరం అర్చత పూజయత. విష్ణవ ఇతి చతుర్థీనిర్దేశస్వారస్యేన నివేదయత ఇత్యర్థః. అర్చనాంగోపచారేషు అర్ఘ్యహవిషోరేవ ప్రాధాన్యమితరేషాం చ పాద్యా చమనీయాదీనాం తదఙ్గత్వమేవ. తథా చ సాఙ్గప్రధానే అర్ఘ్యహవిర్ద్రవ్యే విష్ణవే నివేదయతేత్యర్థః. అనేన నిత్యార్చనముక్తం. భవతి ధియాయత ఇత్యస్య స్తుతి రిచ్ఛత ఇత్యర్థః. యత్తు వః యుష్మాకం పాన్తం పాలనస్వభావం పాతవ్యం వా అంధసః సోమస్వరూపమన్నం ప్రార్చయత ప్రకర్షేణ సంపాదయత అస్మై ధియాయతే స్తుతిరిచ్ఛతే మహే మహతే శూరాయ విక్రాన్తాయ ఇంద్రాయ విష్ణవే వ్యాపకాయ ఏతన్నామకాయ దేవాయచేతి వ్యాఖ్యానమ్. అత్రార్చత ఇత్యస్య సంపాదయతౌ లక్షణాదోషః. న చ ప్రకృతోపయోగిత్వాల్లక్షణా న దోషాయేతి వాచ్యమ్. సంపాదనమాత్రేణ వాక్యార్థాపర్యవసానేన హోమ పర్యన్తలక్షణాయా ఆవశ్యకత్వాత్తదపేక్షయా శక్యార్థపురస్కారేణ ప్రకృతా ర్థోపపాదనస్య న్యాయ్యత్వాత్. అన్ధశ్శబ్దస్య సోమలక్షకత్వమపి దోషః. యద్యపి ఆభిప్లావికేషూక్థ్యేషు స్తోమాతిశంసనే వినియుక్తేయం శంసనం చ అప్రగీతమన్త్ర సాధ్యగుణినిష్ఠగుణ తాత్పర్యకాభిధానమ్. తత్త్వం చ స్తుతశస్త్రాధికరణే క్షుణ్ణమ్. తథా చ సోమపరత్వమేవ ప్రకృతాభిధానాదితి. తథాపి యా సానుని పర్వతానామదాభ్యా మహస్తస్థతురర్వతేవ సాధు నేత్యుత్తరార్థస్య సర్వథా అప్రకృతార్థపరత్వాత్పూర్వార్ధస్యాపి తదనురోధేన అప్రకృతార్థబోధకార్చతేతి పదఘటితస్యా ప్రకృతార్థబోధకత్వమేవ యుక్తమ్. న హ్యగుణినిష్ఠగుణతాత్పర్య కాభిధానం ప్రకృతార్థబోధకతయైవేతి నియన్తుం శక్యమ్. 'తత్తదిదస్యపౌంస్య' మిత్యాది వక్ష్యమాణాసు అప్రకృతార్థబోధినీష్వృక్షు వ్యభిచారాత్. అర్చతే స్సంపాదయతివ్యతిరిక్తార్థబోధకత్వమస్యామేవ సంహితాయాం ప్రథమాష్టకే ప్రథ మాధ్యాయే తృతీయే సూక్తే శ్రూయతే. 'గాయన్తి త్వా గాయత్రిణోర్చన్త్య ర్కమర్కిణ' ఇతి ఏవం చ గాయతేరివార్చతేరపి సమ్పాదయతివిభిన్నార్థబోధ

కత్వమకామేనాప్యభ్యుపగన్తవ్యమితి. చ శబ్దేన ఇంద్రస్య గ్రహణమిత్యుక్తమ్.
ఇంద్రప్రజాపతీ ద్వారగోప్తా ఇతి కౌషీతక బ్రాహ్మణోపనిషది ప్రథమాధ్యాయే
బ్రహ్మశబ్దితస్య విష్ణోర్ద్వారపాలకత్వేనేన్ద్రస్య శ్రవణాత్. స చ విష్ణోః పరివార
భూతస్సఖా చ. ఏవం చ సపరివారవిష్ణ్వర్చనమేవాత్రవిహితమితి మన్తవ్యమ్.
తయోః ప్రభవాతిశయం విహితవిష్ణ్వర్చనాపేక్షితమాహ 'యాసాను' నీతి. యా
యా విష్ణుః ఇన్ద్రశ్చ పర్వతానాం హిమాచల శేషాచలాది పర్వతానాం సానుషు
ప్రస్థప్రదేశేషు 'స్నుః ప్రస్థః సానురస్త్రియా' మిత్యమరః. ఇదముపలక్షణం
స్థానాన్తరస్య, మహః మహాసి సమన్త్రికశిలాగ్రహణరూపోత్పాదన నయనోన్మీల
నాధివాసన స్థాపనాది సంస్కారజన్య తేజోవిశేషవిశిష్టే బింబే ఆదాభ్యా పరైర
నభిదావ్యా సన్తః అర్వతేవ స్థితేన అశ్వేనేవ స్థితేన సాధునా వాహనభూత గరు
డేన సహ తస్థతుః ప్రతిష్ఠితౌ భవతః. విష్ణవే చార్చతేత్యర్చనం విహితమ్. అర్చ
నం చ బిమ్బ ఏవ జ్యాయః. తచ్చ ప్రతిష్ఠితమేవ గ్రాహ్యమ్. ప్రతిష్ఠయా ప్రతి
మాసు దేవతానాం సర్వదా సన్నిధానసంభవాత్. అనేనోత్తరేణార్ధేన భగవతో
నారాయణస్య సపరివారస్య పూర్వార్ధవిహితార్చనోపకారక బింబప్రతిష్ఠా అభి
హితేతి భావ్యమ్. అనేన పూర్వార్ధోత్తరార్ధయోరేకవాక్యతా సంపద్యత
ఇతి. యద్యపి స్థండిలజలకూర్చాదావపి విష్ణ్వర్చనం భవతీతి న తద్రూపా
కాంక్షా, తథాపి తద్రూపబింబస్యాప్యధిష్ఠానత్వావిశేషాత్ 'షడంగులాదహీనం
తద్రూపం కల్పయి' త్వేతి వేదాంగకల్పసూత్రాచ్చ 'విష్ణుం ప్రతిష్ఠాప్య
సాయం ప్రాతర్హోమాన్తేర్చయతీతి ప్రతిష్ఠాపిత బింబ ఏవ విష్ణ్వర్చన విధాయక
కల్పసూత్రాచ్చ విష్ణ్వర్చనోపకారకత్వం విష్ణుప్రతిష్ఠాయా అక్షత మితి ప్రతిష్ఠా
చ బింబసాపేక్షేతి విష్ణ్వర్చనే బింబస్యాంగత్వమనివార్యమ్. యద్యప్య
ర్చనవిధిః స్వతన్త్రః ప్రతిష్ఠావిధిశ్చ స్వతన్త్రః తథాపి ప్రతిష్ఠా అర్చనం చ
స్వస్వాధిపూరకే భవతః. తథా చ న పరస్పరాకాంక్షా, తథాపి 'ప్రతిష్ఠాప్య
సాయం ప్రాతర్హోమాన్తేర్చయ' తీతి నిర్దేశాన్యథానుపపత్త్యా ఆధానప్రయుక్తా
ధానోపజీవి క్రతువిధిరివ ప్రతిష్ఠావిధిప్రయుక్తప్రతిష్ఠోపజీవి అర్చనవిధిరితి జ్ఞేయమ్.
అత ఏవ 'విష్ణవే చార్చత' ఇతి విష్ణ్వర్చనం విధాయ 'యాసాను' నీత్యాద్యుత్త
రార్ధేన తత్ప్రతిష్ఠా ప్రతిపాదితా. ఏతామేవర్చం సమ్యగాలోచ్య వేదాంగ
వేదోదితాగ్నిహోత్రాదిధర్మప్రయోగ బోధకకల్పసూత్రకృతా భగవతా విఖ

నసా కల్పసూత్రే చతుర్థప్రశ్నే ‘విష్ణుం ప్రతిష్ఠాప్య సాయం ప్రాతర్హోమాన్తే
ఽర్చయతి. షడఙ్గులాదహీనం తద్రూపం కల్పయిత్వా పూర్వపక్షే పుణ్యే
నక్షత్రే ప్రతిష్ఠాం కుర్యా’దితి సూత్రితమ్. ప్రతిష్ఠా చ న కేవలం బిమ్బప్రతిష్ఠా
మాత్రమ్. ‘తస్మాత్పూర్వం తృతీయేఽహన్యౌపాసనాగ్నికుండం కృ’త్వేతి
బిమ్బస్యాక్ష్యున్మేషణజలాధివాసషోడశకలశ స్నపనాలంకారప్రతిసరబంధశయనా
దికముపపాద్య కుంభస్థాపనముపక్రమ్య ‘నిష్కలం దేవం హృదయాత్తమాధావే
రుక్మాభం రక్తనేత్రాస్యపాణిపాదం శ్రీవత్సాఙ్కం చతుర్భుజం పీతాంబరధరం
శంఖచక్రధరం సౌమ్యం సకలం ధ్యాత్వా ప్రణమే’దితి భగవత్స్వరూపధ్యా
నాదికముపపాద్య ప్రతిష్ఠాయాః శ్రౌతత్వాయ ‘అగ్నిం పరిషిచ్య హోత్రం ప్రశం’
స్యేత్యాదినా శ్రౌతాసాధారణం హోత్రశంసనాదికముపపాద్యావాహనజుష్టాకార
హోమాంశ్చ నిర్దిశ్యానన్తరం దేవోత్థాపనం కుంభేన సహ దేవసయనమప్యుప
పాద్య ‘గృహే వాయవ్యే దేవాయతనేఽగ్నిశాలాయాం వా అర్చాపీఠే రత్నం
సువర్ణం వా సన్న్యస్య విష్ణుసూక్తపురుషసూక్తాభ్యాం విష్ణుం ప్రతిష్ఠాపయామీతి
ప్రతిష్ఠాప్య బింబస్య మూర్ధ్ని నాభౌ పాదే చ సువర్భువర్భూరితి హృదయే ప్రణవం
విన్యస్య ఇదం విష్ణురితి దేవం ధ్యాయన్ కుంభస్థమాధావం శక్తియుతం కూర్చే
నాదాయ బింబస్య మూర్ధ్ని విష్ణుమావాహయామీతి సంస్రావ్యావాహనం
కరోతి విధినైవమారాధ్య హవిర్నివేదయే’దిత్యాది సూత్రవాక్యైః విష్ణుశక్తి
స్థాపనస్యాపి బింబే ప్రతిష్ఠాశబ్దార్థత్వావసాయాత్, బింబే శక్తిస్థాపనమపి ప్రతిష్ఠా
శబ్దార్థః. స్థాపితాయాః విష్ణుతేజోరూపశక్తేః యథా బింబమవస్థాప్య సర్వదావస్థా
నాత్తత్రైవార్చనం యుక్తమితి యా సానునీత్యాదినా ప్రతిష్ఠోపన్యాసః. యా
సానుని పర్వతానామితి నిర్దేశాన్యథానుపపత్త్యా ఆలయే విష్ణోరారాధనం కర్తవ్య
మిత్యుక్తం భవతి. తత్రైవ ఇంద్రశబ్దితస్య తాపసస్య అర్వతేవేతి దృష్టాన్త
నిర్దేశబలేన సాధుశబ్దేన లక్షితస్య వేదమూర్తేః సజ్జనస్య వాహనరూపస్య గరు
డస్య చ స్థితిర్భవతి. ‘ఆదిత్యో యూప’ ఇత్యాదావష్టాశ్రీకరణ ఘృతలేప
నాదినా జన్యప్రకాశరూపేణ ఆదిత్యాభేదో యూపే ప్రతిపాద్యతే యథా తథా
రూపోత్పాదన నయనోన్మీలన కలశస్నపనాదినా క్రియాభిర్బింబస్యాపి ప్రకాశ
సంభవాత్సారూప్యేణ తేజోవాచిమహాశ్శబ్దేన బింబం లక్ష్యతే. యద్వా అర్వతేవ
స్థితేన సర్వాత్మనా వాహనవచ్ఛేషభూతేన ప్రాపకేన సాధునా జ్ఞానభక్తియోగ

ధ్యానాదిభగవత్ప్రతిష్ఠాపకగుణసంపన్నేన 'తేషు జ్ఞానోత్కటం శుభదర్శనం శ్రుతవృత్తశీలసమ్పన్నమేకం గురుం వరయే' దిత్యాది భగవన్మరీచ్యాదిశాస్త్రోక్తలక్షణసంపన్నేన విఖనస్సూత్రేణ ఆచార్యేణ మహః ధ్యానయోగబలేన ప్రతిష్ఠాకాలే సమ్యక్ ధ్యాతదివ్యతేజోరూపిణౌ సన్తౌ తస్థతుః, బిమ్బంవ్యాప్య తిష్ఠతః ఇతి. అస్మిన్ పక్షే బింబమాత్రేవ్యాప్తిస్సిద్ధ్యతి. తదన్తరా ప్రతిష్ఠాయా అసంభవాత్. తథా చ ప్రతిష్ఠితాభ్యాం దేవాభ్యామర్ఘ్యం హవిశ్చార్చత నివేదయతేతి పూర్వేణాన్వయః. నివేదనమర్చనవ్యాప్యో ధర్మః. ఏవం చ సపరివారం భగవన్తం పర్వతాదిప్రదేశేషు విమానే బింబసమానరూపతయా తేజోవిశేషేణ ప్రతిష్ఠాకర్మణా బింబే సర్వదా ప్రతిష్ఠితం భగవన్తం విష్ణుం విష్ణుప్రాధాన్యబోధినా అత ఏవ వైదికేన వైఖానసాఖ్యేన విధినా విష్ణుప్రాధాన్యవాదిభిర్వైదికైః విఖనస్సూత్రిభిరర్చయేదితి. యా సానుని పర్వతానామిత్యస్య స్థానాన్తరోపలక్షకత్వాద్గృహాదిరపి స్థానం భవతి. తత్రవిధానబలాత్పరివారశూన్యస్య కేవలస్య విష్ణోః ప్రతిష్ఠాపూర్వమర్చన మధికారీ విఖనస్సూత్రీ అన్యోపి ద్విజాతిః. 'ద్విజాతిరతంద్రితో నిత్యం గృహ' ఇతి సూత్రాత్. ఆలయే సపరివారస్య విష్ణోర్వైఖానసవిధినా వైఖానసైర్విప్రైరేవ విఖనస్సూత్రీ అన్యోపి ద్విజాతిరర్చనం కుర్యాదితి వివేకః. యదపి 'యా యావింద్రావిష్ణూ పర్వతానాం ప్రీణనవతాం పూరణవతాం వా పర్వతశబ్దో యాస్కేనైవం నిరుక్తః; పర్వవాన్ పర్వతః పర్వ పునః పృణాతేః ప్రీణాతేర్వా' ఇత్యుక్తలక్షణానాం లోకానాం సానుని సముచ్ఛ్రితప్రదేశే సర్వలోక ఇత్యర్థః. అథ వా మేఘానాం సముచ్ఛ్రితప్రదేశే పర్వతశబ్దః మేఘనామసూక్తత్వాత్. తత్ర తస్థతుః తిష్ఠతః. కీదృశౌ తౌ అదాభ్యా అదంభనీయౌ పరైరనభిదావ్యౌ అత ఏవ మహః మహాన్తౌ యద్వా మహః మహసి స్వతేజసి సానునీత్యనేన సమ్బన్ధః. తత్ర దృష్టాన్తః సాధునా అభిమతప్రదేశప్రాపణసమర్థేన అర్వతా వేగవతా అశ్వేనేవ తేన యథా అత్యుచ్ఛ్రితం ప్రదేశమారోహతి తద్వదుచ్చం పదమారూఢౌ తస్మాత్తాభ్యామర్చతేతి వ్యాఖ్యాతమ్. తత్ర పర్వతశబ్దస్య సానుశబ్దస్య చ ప్రసిద్ధార్థపరత్వే సంభవత్యప్రసిద్ధార్థకల్పనం సాధునేత్యస్య విశేష్యపరత్వే సమ్భవతి విశేషణత్వకల్పనం కృత్స్నస్య పూర్వార్ధవిహితార్చనాననుగుణత్వం చ దోషాః. హిమాచలే బదరికాశ్రమే నరనారాయణరూపతయా విష్ణోరిన్ద్రస్య తద్ద్వారపాలశబ్దిత నరరూపతయా అవస్థానాత్ శ్రీవేంకటాచల

వృషభాచలాదౌ విష్ణురూపతయా తద్ద్వారపాలరూపతయా అవస్థానస్య దర్శనాచ్చ పర్వతాదిశబ్దా నామస్మదుక్తార్థకత్వమేవ యుక్తమితి. ఏతదైతరేయశాఖా ప్రవర్తకః ఋగ్విధానకర్తా ఐతరశాఖాకల్పసూత్రకారాశ్వలాయనాచార్యః భృగువంశతిలకో భగవాన్ శౌనకోపి అస్యా ఋచః విష్ణ్వర్చనవిధాయకత్వమేవావోచత్. యథా 'శౌనకోహం ప్రవక్ష్యామి నిత్యం విష్ణ్వర్చనం పరమ్ ప్రవః పాన్తమన్ధసో ధియాయేత్యర్చవిధానతః' ఇతి. భగవానపి మరీచిః భగవచ్ఛాస్త్రే శ్రీవైఖానసే విమానార్చనాకల్పే ప్రథమపటలే 'తస్యార్చనే శ్రుతిః 'ప్రవః పాన్తమన్ధసో ధియాయతే మహేశూరాయ విష్ణవే చార్చత-ధృతోర్ధ్వపుండ్రః పరమేశితారం నారాయణం పూజయతి స్మ భక్త్యా, అర్ఘ్యాదిభిః పౌరుషసూక్తమంత్రైః సంప్రాప్నుయాద్విష్ణుపదం మహః' త్రైతి. ఏతేన విష్ణ్వర్చనస్య విష్ణవే చార్చతేతి విహితత్వాన్నిత్యత్వం వైదికత్వం చ భావ్యమితి.

అభ్యుదయ నిశ్శ్రేయస సాధనముగ నిట్లు భగవదర్చనమును విధించిన శ్రుతి యాయర్చనమునకవలంబముగ భగవానుని దివ్యమంగళ విగ్రహము శిలచే నిర్మింపబడు ప్రకారమును కూడ చెప్పియున్నది. 'అద్భ్యః సమ్భూతః పృథివ్యై రసాచ్చ, విశ్వకర్మణః సమవర్తతాధి, తస్య త్వష్టా విదధద్రూపమేతి, తత్పురుషస్య విశ్వమాజానమగ్రే, వేదాహమేతం పురుషం మహాన్తమ్, ఆదిత్యవర్ణం తమసః పరస్తాత్, తమేవం విద్వానమృత ఇహ భవతి, నాన్యః పన్థా విద్యతేఽయనాయ' (పురుషసూక్తము). దీనికి శ్రీ శ్రీనివాసమఖియనుగ్రహించిన యర్థమిట్లున్నది. 'అయమర్థః. అపాం పృథివ్యాశ్చ రసాత్సారభాగాత్ సంభూతః ఉపలఇత్యర్థః. తస్య జలభూమిసారరూపత్వాత్ విశ్వకర్మణః బ్రహ్మణః సకాశాత్సమవర్తత సమీచీనరూపేణావర్తత బ్రహ్మణస్సంకల్పవశాత్సమీచీనా శిలా జాయత ఇత్యర్థః. తస్యోపలస్య త్వష్టా రూపం విదధత్ అకరోదిత్యర్థః. తత్తథా రూపకల్పనం పురుషస్యాగ్రే ఆజానం జన్మ ఆవిర్భావ ఇతి యావత్. ఏవం పరమపురుషావిర్భావజ్ఞానస్య ముక్తిప్రదత్వం శ్రూయతే 'తమేవం విద్వానమృత ఇహ భవ'తీతి. ఇట్లేయజుర్వేదమందు మరియొకశ్రుతి భగవానుని శిలాతాదాత్మ్యమును బోధించునది కలదు. ఆశ్రుతియానుపూర్వి యిట్లున్నది 'యతో వీరః కర్మణ్యః సుదక్షో యుక్తగ్రావా జాయతే దేవకామః'.

దీక్షితీయము:—

అయమర్థః. వీరో విష్ణుః 'ఉగ్రం వీరం మహావిష్ణు' మితి నృసింహ తాపి న్యాం విష్ణోర్వీరత్వం ప్రసిద్ధమ్, విష్ణోర్నుకం వీర్యాణీతి శ్రుతేః. విష్ణునా సదృశో వీర్య ఇతి శ్రీమద్రామాయణవచనాత్. కర్మణ్యః కర్మభిరారాధ్యః సుదక్షః భక్తాభీష్టకరణసమర్థః దేవకామః క్రీడాకామః దివ్ క్రీడేత్యాదిధాతోః. యుక్త గ్రావా శిలారూపీత్యర్థః. జాయత ఇతి. అపి చ. 'పిశంగరూపః సుభరో వయో ధాః శ్రుష్టీ వీరో జాయతే దేవకామః'. అయమర్థః పిశంగరూపః సువర్ణవర్ణః సుభరః సుఖేన భర్తుం శక్యః వయసా గరుడేన ధ్రియత ఇతి వయోధాః శ్రుష్టీ బలవాన్ 'శ్రుష్టీతు బలవాన్ బలీ'తి నిఘంటుః. దేవకామో జాయతే ప్రతిమా రూపో భవతి. 'అశ్మానమాఖణం ప్రపద్యే' ఇతి చ శ్రూయతే. అయమర్థః. ఆఖణం శిల్పినా శాస్త్రమనుసృత్య టంకేనోత్కీర్ణరూపం అశ్మానం పాషాణ మయం పరమాత్మానం ప్రపద్య ఇతి. కేవలాశ్మనః ప్రపత్త్యాసంభవాత్. ముండోపనిషది 'ఆవిస్సన్నిహితం గుహాచరం నామ మహత్పద మత్రైతత్సమర్పిత' మితి. అయమర్థః. గుహాచరం నామ హృదయగుహావర్తితయా ప్రసిద్ధం బ్రహ్మ విష్ణ్వాఖ్యం తస్యైవ హృదయస్థత్వాత్, ఆవిః ఆచార్యహృదయాదావిర్భూయ సన్నిహితం ప్రతిమాయాం సాన్నిధ్యవద్భవతి. అత్ర ప్రతిమారూపే భగవతి ఏతత్సర్వం సమర్పితమితి.

ఇట్లే 'యద్దేవానాం చక్షుష్యాగో అస్తి' అనుశ్రుతివ్యాఖ్యానమందు పాషా ణాదిమయ దేవ దర్శనముచేసినప్పుడు అనమస్కార రూపమగు నపరాధము నీశ్రుతి చెప్పుచున్నట్లు భాష్యకారులభిప్రాయపడుటచే దేవతావిగ్రహము లను వేదము లెరుగుననుటలో సందియములేదు.

సకల నిష్కలరూపియగు సర్వేశ్వరుని రూపవత్త్వము 'య ఏషోంత రాదిత్యే హిరణ్మయః పురుషో దృశ్యతే, యథా కప్యాసం పుండరీకమేవ మ క్షిణీ' ఇత్యాది శ్రుతులందు చెప్పబడి 'రుక్మాభం స్వప్నధీగమ్యం' మొదలగు మన్వాది వచనములచే నుపబృంహితమునై భగవచ్ఛాస్త్రములందు వ్యాఖ్యా నించబడిన సమూర్తపూజాలంబనమై యొప్పియున్నది.

పై విధముగ శిలయందేర్పడిన భగవత్సాన్నిధ్యము లేక బింబప్రతిష్ఠయనునది తప్ప తక్కినవిధానముపాసనముకు యోగ్యము కాజాలదని కఠోపనిషత్తు చెప్పుచున్నది. అందలి 'న సందృశే తిష్ఠతి రూపమస్య న చక్షుషా పశ్యతి కశ్చనైనమ్, హృదా మనీషా మనసాభిక్లృప్తో య ఏతద్విదురమృతాస్తే భవన్తి' యను మంత్రమును గమనించదగును. దీని యర్థమిట్లు చెప్పబడినది. 'అస్యవిష్ణోః రూపం సందృశే సందర్శనవిషయే న తిష్ఠతి అనేన తస్య రూపమస్తీత్యవగమ్యతే, కశ్చిదేనం చక్షుషా న పశ్యతి తర్హి కథముపాసితుం శక్యః స్యాదిత్యత్రాహ హృదా పరమాత్మనో హృదయస్యైవ శ్రుతిరూపత్వాత్ శ్రుతిప్రమాణేనేత్యర్థః, మనీషా మనస ఈష్ట ఇతి మనీట్ తేన మనునేత్యర్థః మనుః స్మర్తౄణాం ముఖ్యః తద్గ్రహణేన సకలస్మృతయ ఉచ్యన్తే, స్మృతి ప్రమాణేనేత్యర్థః. మనసా మనశ్శబ్దేన భృగ్వాదయ ఉచ్యన్తే తద్వచనరూప శ్రీశాస్త్ర ప్రమాణేనేత్యర్థః అభిక్లృప్తః బింబరూపేణ కల్పిత ఇతి యే విదుః తే అమృతా భవన్తి. అథ వా హృచ్ఛబ్దేన సకలశ్రుతిస్మృతి శ్రీశాస్త్ర శిల్పాదీనామభిప్రాయో గృహ్యతే తేన తమనుసృత్యేత్యర్థః. మనీషా ఆచార్యబుద్ధ్యా విభక్తి లోపశ్ఛాన్దసః. మనసా శిల్పిచిత్తేన చ అభిక్లృప్త ఇతి. భగవదవతార రహస్య వేదినాం సంసారబంధమోచనం నిగద్యతే. 'అవతారస్య సత్యత్వ మిత్యారభ్య ఇతి జన్మ రహస్యం యో వేత్తి ముక్తో భవే' దిహేతి. అర్చారూపమప్యవతార విశేష ఏవ. అర్చాత్మనావతీర్ణం మాం జానన్నోపి విమోహితాః, కృత్వా దారు శిలాబుద్ధిం గచ్ఛన్తి నరకాయుత' మితి.

పైయంశమునే ముండోపనిషత్తుకూడ చెప్పియున్నది. అచ్చటి మంత్రమిది. 'నాయమాత్మా బలహీనేన లభ్యో న చ ప్రమాదాత్తపసో వా ప్యలింగాత్, ఏతైరుపాయైర్యతతే యస్తు విద్వాంస్తస్యైష ఆత్మా విశతే బ్రహ్మధామ' అయమర్థః. అయమాత్మా పరమపురుషః బలహీనేన భగవదారాధనానుకూల శరీరేంద్రియ పాటవరహితేన న లభ్యః ప్రమాదాత్ భగవదారాధనోప కరణార్జనానవధానాత్ అలింగాత్ప్రతిమారహితాత్ తపసః ధ్యానాద్వా న లభ్యః. లింగశబ్దస్య మూర్తిపరత్వం భాగవతే ఏకాదశే, 'ద్రవ్యక్షిత్యాత్మలింగాని నిష్పాద్య ప్రోక్ష్యచాసనమ్' ఇతి. తప ఆలోచన ఇతి ధాతోః తపశ్శబ్దస్య ధ్యానపరత్వం కథం లభ్యత ఇత్యత్రాహ, ఏతైరుపాయైరితి. ప్రమాదరహి

తార్చనధ్యానాదిరూపై రిత్యర్థః, యతతే తస్యాత్మా బ్రహ్మధామ పరంపదం విశత ఇతి'

ఇట్లే ఋగ్వేదకాలమందు ప్రసిద్ధికెక్కి నేటికిని సేతుశీతాచలమధ్యస్థమగు పవిత్ర భారతభూమియందు పుణ్యక్షేత్రములుగ పరిగణింపబడుచు కోట్లకొలది భక్తుల నాకర్షించుచు స్వయంవ్యక్త క్షేత్రములైన శ్రీవేంకటాద్రియు శ్రీజగన్నాథమును ఋగ్వేదమందు కంఠోక్తముగ స్తుతింపబడియున్నవి. వానియూను పూర్వి యిది.

'అరాయి కాణే వికటే గిరిం గచ్ఛ సదాన్వే ।
శిరింబిఠస్య సత్త్వభి స్తేభిష్ట్వా చాతయామసి ॥ ౧.

చతో ఇతశ్చత్తా ముతః సర్వా భ్రూణాన్యారుషీ ।
అరాయ్యం బ్రహ్మణస్పతే తీక్ష్ణశృంగో దృషన్నిహి ॥ ౨.

అదో యద్దారు ప్లవతే సింధోః పారే అపూరుషం
తదారభస్వ దుర్హణో తేన గచ్ఛ పరస్తరమ్' ౩.

(ఋగ్వేదం మం ౧౦ సూక్తం ౧౫౫. = అష్టకం ౮-౮-౧.)

మొదటిమంత్రమునకు శ్రీశ్రీనివాసమఖి వ్యాఖ్యానమిట్లు కానవచ్చుచున్నది. హే అరాయి ఐశ్వర్యహీనే కాణే ఏకాక్షి అంధస్య గమనశక్త్యభావాత్ కాణస్య యథాకథంచిద్గమనయోగ్యతా సంభవతీతి కాణ ఇత్యుక్తమ్. వికటే గిరిం వేంకటగిరిం ప్రతి గచ్ఛ 'చతుర్హూతో హ వై నామైషః తం వా ఏతం చతుర్హూతగ్ం సన్తం చతుర్హోతేత్యాచక్షతే పరోక్షేణ పరోక్షప్రియా ఇవ హి దేవాః ప్రత్యక్షద్విషః' ఇతి శ్రుతేః పరోక్షేణోక్తమ్. సదాన్వే సర్వదా అన్వేషణం కురు. యద్వా సర్వదా అన్వేషయ. శిరిం వీఠస్య శ్రీవికటకస్య 'స్వామి పుష్కరిణీతీరే కోటికందర్పరూపవాన్, ఆస్తే లక్ష్మ్యా చ ధరయా రమన్ షోడశవార్షికః' ఇతి. సత్త్వభిః సాత్త్వికగుణైః తేభిష్ట్వా సత్వం ఛాదయామసీతి ' ఇత్యాది.

పై ఋఙ్మంత్రము పారమాత్మికోపనిషత్తునందలి 'రయిః కకుద్మాన్' మంత్రవ్యాఖ్యానమున శ్రీదీక్షితేంద్రునిచే నిర్వహణముచేయబడినది. ఆమంత్ర మిట్లు వ్యాఖ్యానింపబడియున్నది.

'రయిః కకుద్మాన్విదధద్వినష్టం రయిమద్విధానమ్*
తస్మై కకుత్స్థే వికటాయ పిత్రే స్వాహా'

(పారమాత్మికము 2 అనువాకము 3-వ మంత్రము)

'రయిః ఐశ్వర్యరూపః కకుద్మాన్ వృషభాచలవాన్, యద్వా శ్రేష్ఠః విదధద్వినష్టం యేన కేన ప్రకారేణ యస్మై కస్మైచిద్వినష్టం పదార్థం వరప్రదానాది ముఖేన విదధత్ప్రాపయన్. రయిమద్విధానం రయిరిత్యనేన 'ఋచస్సామాని యజూగ్ంషి సా హి శ్రీరమృతా సతా' మితిశ్రుత్యుక్తం విధానం విధిః అనేన శాస్త్రయోనిత్వం దర్శితమ్. శ్రుతిప్రసిద్ధ ఇత్యర్థః. కకుత్స్థే కకుది స్థితాయ వికటాయ వేంకటాయ' ఇత్యాది.

పూర్వోక్త తృతీయఋక్కునకు సాయణభాష్య మిట్లున్నది

'అదో విప్రకృష్టదేశే వర్తమానం అపూరుషం నిర్మాత్రా పురుషేణ రహితం యద్దారు దారుమయం పురుషోత్తమాఖ్యం దేవతాశరీరం సింధోః పారే సముద్రతీరే జలస్యోపరి వర్తతే తద్దారు హే దుర్హణో దుఃఖేన హననీయ కేనాపి హన్తుమశక్య హేస్తోతః ఆరభస్వ ఆలంభస్వ ఉపాస్స్వేత్యర్థః తేన దారుమయేన దేవేన ఉపాస్యమానేన పరస్తరం అతిశయేన తరణీయం, ఉత్కృష్టం వైష్ణవం లోకం గచ్ఛ' యనిచెప్పి పూరీక్షేత్ర మందలి శ్రీజగన్నాథుని దారుమయ దివ్యమంగల విగ్రహస్తావకముగ రూపించి పక్షాన్తరమునుగూడ 'అపర ఆహ' యని వేరొకరూపణమును చెప్పియున్నారు.

ఇట్లే యజుస్సునందు తైత్తిరీయ నారాయణానువాకమందలి 'అంభస్య పారే భువనస్య మధ్యే నాకస్య పృష్ఠే మహతో మహీయాన్' శ్రుతియందు పేర్కొనబడిన మహార్ణవము, భువనమధ్యము, నాకపృష్ఠము నను మూడు దివ్యక్షేత్రములలో భువనమధ్యము శ్రీవేంకటాద్రియనియే దీక్షితేంద్రుని యభిప్రాయమైయున్నది. 'తేనేదం పూర్ణం పురుషేణ సర్వం' అని సర్వవ్యాపియగు పరమేశ్వరునకు పై జెప్పబడిన మూడుస్థానములు సాన్నిధ్య విశేషాధాయకములని

చెప్పుచు సగుణారాధనము నీశ్రుతి ప్రశంసించుచున్నది. ఈశ్రుతికి పైయర్థము 'అంభస్య పారే భువనస్య మధ్యే నాకస్య పృష్ఠే భువి వేంకటాద్రౌ' అని వారాహపురాణోపబృంహితమని వివరింపబడినది.

మరియు 'అంగుష్ఠమాత్రః పురుషోన్తరాత్మా సదా జనానాం హృదయే సన్నివిష్టః' (కఠోపనిషది) యని సర్వత్రపరిపూర్ణుడగు పరబ్రహ్మము సుఖోపాస్యము కాకుండుటచే హృదయ ప్రమాణానుగుణ్యముగ నంగుష్ఠమాత్ర ప్రమాణకర్తృత్వమును ప్రతిపాదించి అట్టియుపాసనము విధింపబడినట్లు ప్రతిమారాధనము గూడ 'హృదా మనీషా' యను శ్రుతిచే విధింపబడినదిగా తెలియదగినది.

ఇంకను ఉపనిషత్ప్రసిద్ధమగునట్టియు గీతోపనిషత్సిద్ధాన్తమైనట్టియు నుపాసనముగూడ పైశ్రుతులు సమూర్తార్చన పరములుగ వ్యాఖ్యానింపబడినప్పుడే సామంజస్యము నందుచున్నవి. ఒకప్పుడుక్తశ్రుతుల కర్థాన్తరమునుజెప్ప సాహసించినను వైదికులందవిరల ప్రచారముగల యుపాసనాశబ్దము 'తేషా ముత్సన్నాః పాఠాః ప్రయోగాదనుమీయన్తే' యను నాపస్తంబ సూత్రము చొప్పున సమూర్తపూజాశ్రుతుల ననుమితిచేయుననుట నిశ్చయము. 'మాం ధ్యాయన్త ఉపాసతే' యను గీతావాక్యమందు ధ్యానోపాసనశబ్దముల పార్థక్య వ్యవహారముచే ధ్యానయుక్తునకు భగవానుని దివ్యమంగల విగ్రహమునందలి కాయికమగు నారాధనము విశేషముగ బోధింపబడుచున్నది. ఇట్లే అగ్న్యుపాసనము, సంధ్యోపాసనము, ఆచార్యోపాసనము ననుచోటులందుపాసన శబ్దమునకు ముఖ్యార్థము బాహ్యకరణవ్యాపారమనుట స్పష్టమగుచున్నది.

కావుననే సకలోపనిషత్ప్రసిద్ధములగు దహరాదిబ్రహ్మ విద్యలలోనెల్ల నీసమూర్తయజనముత్తమమైనదని నిరూపించుచు దీని నుత్తమబ్రహ్మవిద్యయని పూర్వాచార్యులు బహుధా వ్యవహరించియున్నారు. ఆవిస్తరము మరియొక వ్యాసమందు చర్చింపబడును.

పైజెప్పిన యారాధనమును అంగీకరించియు చాలమంది వైదికులునైతము ఈ యారాధన శబ్దార్థమును సంకోచపరచి యిందు విగ్రహరూపముక్తముకాలేదనియు యారాధనవిధి మానసికముగనైనను జరిగి యర్థవంతమగునవియు తలచుచున్నారు. ఈనిర్ణయము సరికాదను విషయమును ముందు చర్చింతుము. ఇంక నవ్యవైదికులన్ననో యుక్త్యాభాసములచే విగ్రహారాధనము వేదకాలమునాటి యార్యులకు తెలియదనియు వేదములందు విగ్రహారాధనముగాని విగ్రహములు గాని యిప్పటి దేవాలయములుగాని లేవనియు చెప్పుచున్నారు.

'Their-religion chiefly consisted of sacrifice in fire with oblations of ghee ordinarily and occasionally of animal sacrifices. The various parts of a sacrifice are mentioned in a hymn to Yagna or sacrifice itself (X 130) where are mentioned Ājya, Paridhi, Brahman, and Pratimā. Elsewhere we have seven paridhis and twenty seven Samidhas (sticks) and barhis, Whether there was idol worship then in vogue cannot be stated, but the Rigvedic Aryans had certain allegorical conceptions about the figures of their Gods. Agni thus had two heads with four horns, three feet and seven hands. But it seems probable that stone or wood images of such figures was not fashioned or worshipped along with sacrifice *which with in praise* of the Deities invoked was their only religious worship. (C. V, Vaidya Sanskrit literature, Sruti period, Page 106)

పరిశోధకులు తమకు లభ్యములగు సాధనముల నీరీతిగ సంగ్రహించియున్నారు.

'There is evidence from the inscriptions that as early as the beginning of the second century B. C. the religion of the Bhāgavatās had found adherents even among the Greeks in Gandhārās, * * Speaking next of the argument based on the Besanagar inscription which records the erection of a Garudastambha by a Yavana Bhāgavata of the second century B. C. one is really surprised at the boldness of the guess that probably the old part of the Gita was written at this time as an Upanishad of the Bhāgavatās. If a yavana Gandhārā was a Bhāgavata in 150 B. C. the Upanishad of the Bhāgavatās must be fearlessly taken several centuries before. But there are other and earlier historical records about the worship of Krishna Bhagavān. Magasthanes records that Krishna was worshipped in Madhura. Alexander's historians record that Porus was a worshipper of Krishna and had his image with him in battle.' (Vaidya Page 44 and 45).

బౌద్ధగ్రంథ నిర్మాతలలో నొకడగు నాగసేనుడు తనకాలమందు దేవాలయములున్నట్లు వ్రాసినాడని చెప్పుదురు. నాగసేనునికాలము 1st century B. C. అని నిర్ణయింపబడినది.

'The Buddhist divine Nāgasēna who lived in the first century before Christ bears testimony to the existence of Hindu temples in his time. In his Milindaphāna he enumerates 8 places which a contemplative Buddhist should avoid'. (Essay on the origin of South Indian temples, N. V. Ramaniah P. 39.)

కౌటిల్యుని అర్థశాస్త్రమందు దేవాలయముల ప్రస్తావనకలదు. కౌటిల్యుని కాలము B. C. నాల్గవశతాబ్దమని నిర్ణయింపబడినది.

'The Artha Sastra of Kautilya, the chanceller of Chandra-Gupta Maurya although a book on politics throws a flood of light on the social and religious conditions of Northern India of the 4th century B. C.'

The temple of the 4th century B. C. appears to have been more or less the same kind of building as the later Hindu temple. But it was not invented by the Indians of that age. There is some evidence to show that the temple was known much earlier than the 4th century B. C. Pānini, the ancient Sanskrit Grammarian who is said to have lived in the time of the Nandas, refers in V 3, 96 and 97 of his Ashtādhyāyi; to two classes of images. These sutras and the commentaries thereon form the subject of a learned discussion by Sten-Konow in the Indian Antiquary XXXVIII.

The Gautama Dharma Sāstra is said to be the oldest of the existing works on the sacred law. It is older than Baudhāyana and Āpastamba and may very well have been anterior to Pānini. This book mentions images of Gods and temples. The references to images occur in IX. (2) Facing or within sight of wind, fire, Brahmins, the Sun, the water, the image of the Gods and cows he shall not eject urine or facces or other impurities. (3) He shall not strech out his feet towards those divine beings (S. B. E. Vol. P. 220). The reference to temples occurs in IX. He shall pass excellent (beings and things) auspicious (beings) temples of Gods, cross roads and the like with his right hand towards them.' I bid P. 226.

'The *manusmruti* and the epics contain many references to temples. But they are not generally taken into accuount. The *Rāmāyana* describes temples built in a highly ornate style., but we cannot take them into consideration because the *Rāmāyana* is said to be a comparitively recent work. According to Hopkins the earliest *Bhārata* makes mention of Devāyatanās or the temples but he destroys the usefulness of his remarks for our purpose by observing that they were insignificant from an architectural point of view. We begin with Magasthanes whose varacity appears to be unimpeachable. 'In their collective capacity' says he in his *Indika* 'they have charge both of their special departments and also of matters affecting general interests as the keeping of public buildings in proper repairs, the regulation of prices, the care of markets harbours and temples.' This passage is the sheet anchor of the chronology of our temples. They were so many about 320 B.C. that they demanded the attention of the Imperial

Government of the Mauryas. The Greek ambassador's reference to the temples is borne out by the evidence of Indian writers.

ఇది యిటులుండ మరికొందరు దేవాలయములు యజ్ఞవాటములందు నిర్మింపబడుచుండెననియు ప్రాచీనులు యజ్ఞములను జేసినప్పుడు ఆపుణ్యప్రదేశములందితరులు నివసించుట యితరవిధములుగ నపవిత్రములజేయుటలను సహింపకను యజ్ఞముల జ్ఞాపకముగ యజ్ఞపురుషుని దివ్యమంగళ విగ్రహమును ప్రతిష్ఠించుచు నారాధించుచువచ్చిరందురు.

మరికొందరు దేవాలయములు ప్రాచీనకాలమందు లేవనియు అప్పటిలో ప్రజలు తమ చనిపోయిన పితృదేవతల జ్ఞాపకముగ శిలలనుజేసి వాని నొకచోట పూడ్చిపెట్టి వత్సరమున కొకతూరి యా సమాధుల నారాధించుచువచ్చిరనియు విభవము పెరిగినకొలది యా సమాధులు పెద్ద కట్టడములై యా శిలలే లింగమూర్తులుగను ఆశిలలు తీసివేయబడి వానిస్థానమందు శిలలతో విగ్రహములు చేయబడి యారాధించబడుచున్నవనియు చెప్పుచున్నారు. ఆదియందు శివలింగములు శివాలయములుమాత్రమే యుండెననియు క్రమముగ నాగరకతవృద్ధియై వైష్ణవదేవాలయములు నిర్మింపబడెననియుకూడ వీరినమ్మకము. ఆలాగే శివక్షేత్రములలో నుత్తమమగు వారణాసిని మహాశ్మశానమని యిప్పుడును శిష్టులు వ్యవహరించుచున్నారు. భవభూతి తన మాలతీమాధవమందు దుర్గాలయము శ్మశానమందున్నట్లు వ్రాసియున్నాడు. రాజాదిత్యుడను చోళరాజు 900 A.D. లో తన తండ్రిని ఖననముచేసినచోటునందు ఈశ్వరాలయమును నిర్మించినట్లు నార్త్ఆర్కాడులోని శోలపుర శాసనమున తెలియుచున్నది. ఆత్తూరుగ్రామమందు 10 A.D. లో 1-వ రాజరాజు తనగురుని సమాధియందు అర్జునేశ్వరాలయమును నిర్మించెననియు శాసనమువలన తెలియుచున్నది. ఇట్టి యాధారములు వీరికికలవు.

మరికొందరు బుద్ధభగవానుని యవతార పరిసమాప్తికి వెనుక బౌద్ధులు నిర్మించెడి స్థూపములను ఆదర్శముగజేసికొని హిందువులు తమ యాలయములను నిర్మించికొనియుండవలెనని యూహించుదురు.

యుక్తివాదములకు తావిచ్చునప్పుడు ఆనిర్ణయములు యుక్త్యంతరములచే కొట్టుబడి యెప్పటికప్పుడు తత్త్వము సందిగ్ధముగనే నిలచిపోవుచుండుటయెల్లరకు ననుభవమే యైయున్నది. ఆర్యులు నాగరకులనియు వారి చాతురియన్యాదృశమైనదనియు నంగీకరించినప్పుడు వారి యాచారములు, నాగరకత, జీవితము మొదలగు సపేక్షితములన్నియు వేదములందు చిత్రింపజేయబడియుండవలయు

ననియు ఋక్కు వేదమునందు స్థానములేని యే స్వల్పముగాని వారికాలమందు లేదనియు చెప్పుట యుక్తముకాదు. పరిశోధకులయంగీకారము ననుసరించి సర్వాపూర్వ లిఖితమగు ఋగ్వేదమునందొక్కొకమంత్రమును పరిశీలించిచూచిన యెడల విగ్రహారాధనమును నిరూపించెడి ఋక్కుల నెన్నిటినో మనము కనిపెట్ట వచ్చును. పూర్వాచార్యులును సంహితాప్రవర్తకులగు మహర్షులును కనిపెట్టిన మంత్రములను ముందు నిరూపించియుంటిని. నిశ్చయముగా ఋఙ్మంత్రములన్నియు స్తుతిరూపములే. అందు యజుర్మంత్రములందువలె ప్రయోగవిధి కానరాదు. ఇట్టియెడ విగ్రహ నిర్మాణ ప్రతిష్ఠాది విధులకుగాని వాని ప్రయోగమునకుగాని అందు తావులేదు. అతీంద్రియ జ్ఞానసంపన్నులగు మహర్షులు కల్పసూత్రకారులును ఆయాఋక్కులకు వినియోగములను కల్పించినవెనుకనే అవి సార్థకములగుచున్నవి. అట్టి ప్రయోగమును విగ్రహారాధనమునుగూడ విస్తారముగ శైవవైష్ణవ సంహితలేమి కల్పసూత్రములేమి విస్తరించినవి. ఇందు సంశయములేదు.

మరియు ప్రేతములకు సంస్కారముల జేయునప్పుడు పాషాణస్థాపనముచేసి యందు ప్రేతము నావాహనముచేసి పూజించుటయే కాలాంతరమున నాగరకులలో విగ్రహపూజయందనుకరింపబడెననియు కరచరణాది రూపకల్పనము ప్రతిష్ఠాదులు ఉద్వాసనచేయకుండుటమాత్ర మిందు విశేషమనియు మొదలగు విపరీత వాదములు కలివిలసితములే యగును.

ఆలయములను నిర్మించునప్పుడు అనుసరింపదగిన వాస్తుపరీక్ష, శల్యపరీక్ష, కర్షణము, భూసంస్కారము మొదలగు విధులు శిల్పశాస్త్రములందును ఆగమములందును విస్తారముగ గలవు. అందు ఆలయము గ్రామమునందుండునట్లున్నదిగాని శ్మశానములందు విధింపబడలేదు. గ్రామ మధ్యమందును వాస్త్వంగ వాస్తుప్రదేశములందును శ్మశానములకు తావులేదు. గ్రామాదులకు శ్మశానములు బహుదూరమునయుండునట్లు విధి యున్నది. స్నానముజేసి పరిశుద్ధులగు వారు శ్మశానములను ప్రామాదికముగగూడ సమీపింపరాదనియు అందధ్యయనము చేయరాదనియు శ్రుతులు చెప్పుచున్నవి. అట్టి యాచారము నేటికిని మన యనుభవమందున్నది. ఆకారణముచేతనే పవిత్రమగు బౌద్ధమతమును

మనపూర్వులు నిరాదరముచేసిరనియు మన మూహింపవచ్చును. బుద్ధునియొక్క గాని బోధిసత్త్వులయొక్క గాని శరీరభాగములను పదిలముజేసి వారి జ్ఞాపకచిహ్నములుగ నిర్మించబడియున్నవనిచెప్పు బౌద్ధస్థూపములు విహారములు అగమ్యములని నేటికిని మనవారు తలచుచున్నారు. ఎచ్చటనైనను కొన్ని పాడుపడిన దేవాలయములు త్రవ్వబడినప్పుడు అందు యెముకలు మొదలగు సమాధి జ్ఞాపకచిహ్నములగుపడినచో నయ్యవి యనాదికాలమందు యాదృచ్ఛికముగ నచ్చటనా యాలయనిర్మాణమునకు పూర్వమందుండెననిగాని యావోటులు పూర్వ మొకప్పుడు స్థూపములుగానుండి మత్సరహతులగు మతావేశ పూరితులచే నాక్రమింపబడి మతాంతరీయములు చేయబడినవనిగాని నిర్ణయించితీరవలయును.

తమ తలిదండ్రులయొక్కగాని గురువులయొక్కగాని సమాధులపై వారి జ్ఞాపకముగ నాలయములు నిర్మించినట్లుగల శాసనములన్నియుగూడ బౌద్ధమతవ్యాప్తికి దరువాతివగుటచే బౌద్ధగంధమున నట్లాచరింపబడియుండునుగాని భారతనాగరకతయందట్టిది నిరూఢముగా లేదు. ఇస్లాము మతమునువలె బౌద్ధమతమును గూడ వైదికులధిక్షేపించుట కిదియు నొక్క నిదానమనుట నిర్వివాదము.

భారత భాగవతాదులందును నష్టాదశపురాణములందును సమూర్తపూజ విస్తారముగ నుపదేశింపబడినను ఆగ్రంథములన్నియు నర్వాచీనములని యొకే సమాధానముచెప్పుటచే వానివలన నీ సమూర్తపూజకు వైదికత్వమును సాధించుట ప్రయోజనకారి కాకపోయినను వైదికాదృతవాఙ్మయ సామాన్యము ముక్తకంఠముగ దీని యస్తిత్వమును ప్రామాణ్యమును ప్రశంసించుటచేతను 'ఇతిహాస పురాణాభ్యాం వేదం సముపబృంహయేత్' అను ప్రమాణముచేత వేదవిహితములుకాని యంశములను ఇతిహాస పురాణాదులు ప్రశంసింపజాలవు గనుకను నియ్యది వేదమూలమే ననుట సత్యము.

ఈ యాచారమొక్క భారతావనియందేగాక ప్రపంచమంతటను నేకరీతిగ లబ్ధప్రతిష్ఠమైయుండుటచే నియ్యది యార్యులకు తెలియనిదని యనరాదు.

ఈసందర్భమున పాశ్చాత్యులు పరిశోధించి తెలిసికొనినట్టి యంశములలో కొన్నిటి నీక్రింద పొందుపరచెదను. ఈక్రింద చెప్పబోవు నాంగ్లభాగము Encyclopoedia of Religion and Ethics, (edited by James Hastings 1914)

లోని Images and idols అను శీర్షిక క్రింద G-D Alviella వ్యాసమునుండి సంగ్రహింపబడినది. అందలి కొన్ని చిత్రములగు భాగములిందు కలవు.

ప్రపంచమున మానవున కొక్కనికే తనయొక్కగాని యితరులయొక్కగాని ప్రతిబింబమును చిత్రించికొను సామర్థ్యముకలదని యాతడు చెప్పుచున్నాడు.

'It must be admitted that man alone possesses the gift of making images. * * * This kind of representation implies not only that man reasons about his ocular impressions, but also that he claims the power of exteieiorizing them accurately and even of reproducing them after they h ive disappeared from his vision'.

కరచరణాద్యవయవములతోఁగూడియుండిన నేటి విగ్రహములకుఁపరిష్కారము గల్గుటకు పూర్వమవాంతరావస్థలు రెండుకలిగి యానల ప్రస్తుతస్థితి యేర్పడినదని యాతడనుచున్నాడు.

Images having a religious value may be divided into three classes; (1) purely representative images, magical images, and (3) idols.

Purely representative images :— This class includes drawn, carved, sculptured. or pamited images whose only aim is to reproduce the features of a real or ideal person, the shape of a well known object, an episode taken from history or legend, the appearance of a sacred spot. or the celebration of a rite. * * * The maker of an image may either contentent himself with imitating an accepted type or seek inspiration for the treatment of his subject in the character and role ascribed to his model by tradition. As a matter of fact, the resemblance to the original person and the accuracy with which scenes are represented are secondary points ; all that is necessary is that people should believe in their accuracy or convention sanction them.

Magical images, i. e., images having magical properties. Primitive man believed that, by tracing an image, he was producing the reality, and that, when he acted on the image he was also acting on the thing itself. As a general rule, the portrait of an object is supposed to give its possessor control over the original.

Idols; i. e., conscious and animated images. The talisman, the fetish, and the idol form an ascending scale. The talisman is a material object endowed with marvellous properties, either because of its nature or of some magical operation it has gone through, or because it is invested with supernatural properties by some external

Power. The fetish is a talisman in which resides the spirit that gives it its power. The idol is a fetish representing the supposed form of the spirit dwelling inside it '-

విగ్రహములను మనుష్యుడు మృగము మొదలగు రూపములతోఁ జేయుటకు ప్రకృతియే ప్రథమశిక్షణమిచ్చినదనియు, ఆతడనుచున్నాడు.

'Idols are formed in various ways. (1) By the natural association of natural objects with the human features which they resemble. (2) by forgetfulness or ignorance of the significance originaly attached to an image (3) by simply manufacturing an image representing a super human being. (4) by the supposed command of the divinity whom the image represents. (5) by means of some magical operation.'

ఆదిమనివాసులందు కానరామిచే కాలముగడచినకొలది నాగరకతస్ఫూర్తియు నాగరకులు తమతమ మతముల పోషణమునకై ఈవిగ్రహారాధనమును సాధనముగ జేసికొని వృద్ధిజెందించిరని యాతనిమతము.

'Strictly speaking, idolatary is neither a general nor a primitive fact. It was entirely unknown in India in Vedic times. We have to go far down in the history of China and Japan to find any traces of its developement. It was not practiced by the nomadic tribes of Semites. Among the jews it appeared only in exceptional cases. * It will be sufficient answer to make note that idolatory is equally unknown to most of the peoples who are to-day still on the lowest rings of the social ladder. We may conclude then that idolatory is but a step in religious evolution and it even represents a comparative advance '.

విగ్రహములను చేయవలయునను నాశ మనుష్యునకు ఆదియందెట్లు స్ఫురించెనో అందునుగురించి ముచ్చటించుచు ఆతడిట్లనుచున్నాడు.

'Then it suddenly dawned upon him that approximate images of them existed in certain fragments of stone, bone, or wood, or in some seed or shell. In his magical operations he may already have used objects which to his infantile imagination seemed like living beings, and for this purpose he naturally employed the natural or chance products most favourable to his illusion. He would then try to increase the resemblance by clumsily touching up the object. The next step would be to carve, or directly manufacture with the help of suitable materials, the image which he wished to possess and utilize.'

JOURNAL
OF
SRI VENKATESVARA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE, TIRUPATI

1. The JOURNAL is the official organ of the Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute and the Oriental College, Tirupati.
2. The JOURNAL appears twice a year, in January and July.
3. Contributions are accepted mainly from the members of the Institute and the staff of the College.
4. Each contribution must be clearly written or type-written on one side of the paper only and must be completely press-ready. No additions other than corrections of printer's errors will be admitted after its acceptance for publication.
5. The Editor reserves to himself the right of accepting, rejecting or modifying any contribution received for publication. Contributors are advised to keep copies of their articles as the Editor does not undertake the responsibility to return the rejected articles.
6. Authors will receive twenty-five reprints of their contributions free of charge.
7. The annual subscription to the Journal is Rs. 10/- post free, (inland) and 20 Sh. or 6 Dollars (foreign) to be paid strictly in advance.
8. Books on Indology in English, Sanskrit and Dravidian Languages, are reviewed in the JOURNAL. All books intended for review are to be sent to the Editor.
9. Advertisement charges &c., may be obtained on application from the Editor.
10. All communications regarding the JOURNAL should be addressed to :—

THE EDITOR,
JOURNAL OF SRI VENKATESVARA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE,
TIRUPATI (SOUTH INDIA).

LIST OF SRI VENKATESVARA ORIENTAL INSTITUTE PUBLICATIONS

	Rs.	A.	P
Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Series:—			
1. **Sri Venkatesvara Kavya Kalapa**, Ed. by Sri D T. Tatacharya	4	0	0
2. **History of Tirupati**, Vol. II by Dr. S. Krishnaswami Aiyangar	3	0	0
3. **Glossary of Indian Philosophical Terms**, by Sri C. V. Sankara Rao	1	8	0
4. **Psychology** (in Telugu) by Dr. K. C. Varadachari ...	2	0	0
5. **Isavasyopanishad Bhashya**, of Venkatanatha Ed. with English Translation by Dr. K. C. Varadachari and Sri D. T. Tatacharya	2	0	0
6. **Samurtarchanadhikarana (Atri Samhita)**, Ed. by Mr. Raghunatha Chakravarti Bhattacharya and Sri M. Ramakrishna Kavi	8	0	0
7. **Suvarnasaptati**, Ed. by Sri N. Aiyaswami Sastri ...	6	0	0
8. **Kenopanishad Bhashya** of Rangaramanuja Ed. with English Translation by Dr. K. C. Varadachari & Sri D. T. Tatacharya	2	0	0
9. **Tirukkural-Kamattuppal** with two old Commentaries Ed. by Sri T. P. Palaniappa Pillai	4	0	0
10. **Sri Venkatesvara Vachanamulu**, Ed. by Sri V. Prabhakara Sastri	1	8	0
Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute Studies:—			
1. **Theory of Knowledge in the Philosophy of Sri Ramanuja**, by Dr. K. C. Varadachari	3	0	0
2 **Rupakaparisuddhi** by Sri D. T. Tatacharya ...	2	0	0

Copies can be had of:—

THE DIRECTOR,

S. V. ORIENTAL INSTITUTE,

TIRUPATI (Chittoor Dt.)

SOUTH INDIA

Printed by: Sri A. JAYARAM NAIDU B.A., at The Tirumalai-Tirupati Devasthanams Press, Tirupati.—180 Copies 150 Pages—21-3-47.

Published by: Sri P. V. RAMANUJASVAMI, M.A., Director, Sri Venkatesvara Oriental Institute, Tirupati.